

Truth Prevailing,


And Detecting

E R R O R :

- O R, 7. 15. 25

An A N S W E R to a Book,
mis-called,

*A Friendly Conference between a Mini-
ster and a Parishioner of his, incli-
ning to Quakerism, &c.*



By Thomas Ellwood.

Isa. 54. 17. *No Weapon that is formed a-
gainst thee, shall prosper; and every Tongue
that shall rise against thee in Judgment, thou
shalt condemn. This is the Heritage of the
Servants of the Lord, and their Righteous-
ness is of me, saith the Lord.*

Printed in the Year 1676.



735103

()

THE
P R E F A C E.

Reader,

THere came lately to my Hand a little Book, bearing the Title of, A Friendly Conference, &c. which having turned over, I found the Drift and Design of it was to infame the People called Quakers, by representing their Principles absurd and heterodox, misstating some, and with sophistical Arguments perverting and opposing others. This, when I had observed, I held myself concerned to vindicate those Truths which we believe and make Profession of, from the Absurdities and Errors which the Author of that Book partly through Ignorance, but principally through Envy, hath endeavoured to fasten on them. This

()
is the Occasion and Subject of the following Discourse, which I recommend to thy serious and impartial Perusal.

Who the Author of the Conference was I did not know, when I writ the Answer to it, he not having so much Ingenuity (not to say Honesty) as to set his Name to his Book. But after the Answer had a good part passed the Press, I received Information concerning the concealed Author, both who and what he is, his Name, Place, &c. which I forbear at present to publish, in Expectation that he himself should do it in his next. If he persist a lurking Adversary, let him not think much, if (after so fair a Warning) I give the world his Name with such an Adjunct as his unmanly Dealing with us deserves. He writes himself, A Lover of the Truth. But seeing Truth seeks no Corners, what should induce him to conceal his Name! If he indeed believed that to be Truth, which he undertook to maintain, he needed not to have been either
afraid

afraid or ashamed to have openly avouched it. Although I do not think men strictly tyed, in all Cases, to affix their Names to whatsoever they write: yet in Matters of Controversie, especially wherein one man shall accuse or charge another Man or People, I conceive the Opponent, in point of Honesty, obliged to give h's Name, as a Caution or Security for making good h's Charge, or giving Satisfaction to the Party injured, in case he fail in his Proof. Certainly this way of striking in the dark, th's skulking way of writing Controverses is very disingenuous, unfair and unmanly; fitter for Feux with h's Dark-Lanthorn, then for one that pretends to be a Minister of the Gospel. But leaving the Author for this time, to hug himself in the dark, and delight in his own Obscurity, I shall offer two or three short hints, relating to the Book it self.

I. Some of the more minute and less material Passages in the Conference, I have purposely omitted, that I might have
more

()
more scope (without swelling t^{his} Book into too great a Bulk) more largely to insist on; and freely handle those things which are indeed of greater weight and Moment.

2. In these Cases wherein I have had occasion to use the Testimonies of Ancient Authors, I have been necessitated, for want of some of the Books them'selves (which in the Country I knew not how to procure) to take some few Quotations upon trust from others; yet not without great Caution in the Choice of those Quotations: for I assure thee, Reader, I would rather choose to lay them all whole'y aside, then knowingly to obtrude one wrong one upon thee.

3. The first Chapter may peradventure seem not so much defensive as offensive, relating more particularly to that Ministry, whereof my Opponent professes himself a Member. But let it be considered, that the Subject was not of my choosing, but his proposing, whose Method and Matter I am in some sort obliged, as a Respondent, to observe.

THE

()

THE
CONTENTS.

Chap. **O** *F the present Ministry:*
I. *The Cause of the Peoples*
not profiting inquired: Some Reasons
of it given, page 1.

Chap. II. *Of using the word Thou*
to a Single Person, p. 27.

Chap. III. *Of Titles and Civil Re-*
spects, as they are called, p. 31.

Chap. IV. *Of Confession,* p. 50.

Chap. V. *Of Perfection,* p. 54.

Chap. VI. *Of Swearing,* p. 100.

Chap. VII. *Of Taking Texts, Stu-*
dyng Sermons and Selling them to the
People, p. 196.

Chap. VIII. *Of Humane Learning,*
Divine Inspiration and Revelation,
p. 205.

Chap. IX. *Of Tythes,* p. 277.
Errata.

()

ERRATA.

THe Reader is desired, before he reads the Book, to correct with his Pen the following Mistakes of the Press. Others of less moment, as Mis-pointings, Mis-placing of Letters, and the like, a friendly Eye (it is hoped) will overlook or excuse.

Page 20. line 16. for ever read even. p. 24 l. 7. f. more
r. move. p. 28 l. 3. f. spoken to r. spoke unto. lin. 12. f.
answered r. as we read. p. 33 l. 24. f. mistake r. mis-state.
p. 40. l. 10. f. same now r. same. Now. p. 65. l. 3. f. that e did
r. that he did. p. 72. l. 20. f. r. 21. r. 22. 105. pag. 77. l. 1.
alter this add sense. p. 86 l. 13. f. two r. who. p. 111. l. 1. f.
that r. that. p. 114. l. 25. f. to r. so. p. 115. l. 25. f. Ambassa-
dour r. Ambassadors p. 116. l. 22. f. I for cannot r. for I
cannot. p. 130. l. 8. f. lib. 72 r. lib. 7. l. 13. f. takest r. takes
it. p. 131. l. 4. f. degenerate r. derogate. p. 132. l. 26. after
saith r. my. p. 137. l. 5. f. commanded r. commended. pag.
149. l. 26. f. Quakeor r. Quakers. p. 154. l. 25. f. margent r.
margin. p. 158. l. 21. f. against r. upon. p. 164 l. 29. f. aid
r. said. p. 179. l. 23. r. prohibition. pag. 202 l. 7. de'e and.
p. 205. l. 2. r. inspiration. p. 209. l. 7. f. pricipal r. principal.
p. 218. l. 11. f. we are far r. we are so far. pag. 237. l. 3. f.
discover r. discovered. p. 240. l. 14. f. concerned r. concer-
ning. pag. 257. l. 10. f. having r. have. lin. 21. f. for r. from.
p. 259. l. 26. dele bis. p. 260. l. 8, 9. f. ye speak r. yet spake.

CHAP

CHAPTER I.

Of the present Ministry: The Cause of the Peoples not profiting inquired: Some Reasons of it given.

THE Nameless Author of the ill-named *Friendly Conference*, to lay a Foundation for his Discourse, causes his Parishioner to report, that *At a Quakers Meeting, a notable Speaker propounded this to the Consciences of the Hearers, Whether any among them could affirm, that he had received any Spiritual Advantage by his long frequenting of the Steeple-houses?*

Whether this Question was ever really thus proposed in any of the *Quakers Meetings*, is not my present Business to inquire. But seeing it is now propounded after such a manner, and that by one who terms himself a *Minister*, I cannot but desire every one, who shall read it either in his Book or this, to consider very seriously of it; and if they be such as still frequent those Places, to propose it most solemnly to their own Consciences;

ees ; for it is indeed of great Concernment to them.

And if (sayes he) *after Inquiry, he found he had received no Profit by it, he bad him further propound this Query to himself, Why am I thus? For if God had any regard to the Priests, or their Worship, he would not be wanting to give a Blessing to their Wayes, &c. Thus far the Parishioner, to which the Minister replies, That the Goodness or Badness of the Ministry is not to be measured by the Want of a sensible Effect upon the Hearts of indisposed and careless Hearers, &c.*

Answer, The Question is not concerning *indisposed and careless Hearers*, but in general Terms, Whether *any* among them, impartially consulting his own Conscience, could affirm, that he had received any Spiritual Advantage by his long frequenting of the Steeple houles ; so that, in drawing it from *any*, to *indisposed and careless Hearers only*, he rather avoids then answers the Question ; which is so much the greater Fault in him, inasmuch as both Question and Answer were of his own framing.

This however is observable, that we have here an implicit Acknowledgment of the Peoples not profiting under the present Ministry,

Try, which in pag. 6. is more freely confess-
 in these words, *Alas! its our Hearts Grief,*
that our People should come into the Church, as
the Beasts into Noah's Ark, go out Beasts, as
they came in Beasts; or like unto Pharaoh's
lean Kine, no fatter for all their feeding.
 Hence the People may take notice, what their
 so long and chargeable Attendance upon this
 Ministry hath produced them, namely, to
 be by their Ministers themselves reputed
Beasts, and Lean Beasts too, no fatter for all
their feeding. Surely it concerns them to
 consider well, what manner of *Feeding* they
 have had, which yields *so little Nourishment.*
 But however the Priests have fed the People,
 it is evident the People have fed the Priests
 well; for they are grown *fat and wanton;*
 whence may be well infer'd, That the Priests
 are better fed then the People taught; be-
 ing such as the Prophet pro-
 nounced wo against of old, *Ezek. 34.*
who fed themselves, and eat the 23 3.
Fat, but fed not the Flock,

But the Minister not liking (as it seems)
 the former Question, tells his *Parishioner,*
 (pag. 6.) that *The Question, if rightly star-*
red, will be this, Not Whether you have profi-
ted by our Ministry? but Whether you might

not have profited, had not the Fault been in your selves?

Ans. The Cause being thus far yielded by the Minister, as to matter of fact, namely, that People are not really profited by their Ministry, this other Question of his leads both me and them to consider where the Fault of their Non proficiency lies. We read of some in former times, who (though they did probably take as much pains as any of these men now adayes do, yet) did not profit the People at all; and the Reason thereof is also given. Now, inasmuch as similar (or like) Effects are commonly produced from similar Causes, let us inquire the Cause of that Defect, which may probably give some Light to this. In the 23d of *Jeremiah* vers. 30. the Lord by the Prophet saith, *Therefore behold, I am against the Prophets that steal my Word every one from his Neighbour: Behold I am against the Prophets, saith the Lord, that use their Tongues, and say, He saith: Behold I am against them that prophesy False Dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my People to Err by their Lyes and by their Lightness, yet I sent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this People at all, saith the*

the Lord, vers. 32. Here the very Ground and Reason why that Ministry did not profit, nay, why it was rendred uncapable of profiting the People at all, is most plainly given by God himself, viz. *He sent them not, nor commanded them*: They used their Tongues, and said he saith, when the Lord had *not* spoken to them: They stole his Word every one from his Neighbour: They ministred not from *that* Word which *Moses* long before, and *Paul* long since declared to be *in the Mouth and in the Heart*; which Word the Lord by his Prophet setteth forth to be like as a Fire, & like a Hammer, that breaks the Rock in pieces; There fore said the Lord by the same Prophet, *He that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully; what is the Chaff to the Wheat?* As if he had said, My Word only, my pure heart-cleansing Word, that like a Fire doth burn up all Corruption, and like a Hammer breaks the Rocky Heart in pieces, this only is comparable to Wheat (the Staff of Bread) All the Divinations of Man's Brain, his highest Notions and Conceptions, his studied Discourses and most

Dent. 30. 14.

Rom. 10. 8

Jer. 23. 29.

Vers. 28.

learned Exercitations, they are all but *Chaff* in comparison of this Word. And because those Prophets did not attend to *this Word in th: Heart*, but stole the Word from their Neighbours, *and preached what they had stole*, because they said, *The Lord saith*, when the Lord had *not* spoken to them (though he had spoken to others) because they ran, and he never sent them, nor gave them any such Command, this was the very Reason why they neither *did nor could profit the People at all*.

Now let us see how the Case stands with the Ministers of *England*; Hath God sent them, or do they *send one another*? Do they attend unto the Word in their Hearts, or do they *steal the Words* from their Neighbours? Do they use their Tongues, and say, *He saith*, when the Lord hath *not* spoken to them? If so, how then can any Benefit be expected from them, the Lord having said expressly of such, *They shall not profit the People at all*? Now, that they do *send one another*, that they are Ministers of *Man's making*, common Experience shews, If they were sent of God, they would *speak as the Oracles of God*. If they ministered by Command from him, they would

2 Pet. 4.
11.

would do it as of the Ability which God giveth, that God in all things might be glorified, through Jesus Christ. But this divine Ability they relye not on, nor indeed expect. But School-Learning and Humane Abilities, acquired by Study & much Reading, these they trust to, these they depend on, these they glory not a little in; yea, these they Extol to so high a pitch, as if our Saviour were not a little beholding thereto, and that the Gospel could not be preached without them, as this Minister doth broadly enough insinuate, when he sayes, that *Men wholly illiterate are not fit to preach the* pag 98. *Gospel*; and in divers places of his prolix Discourse on that Subject, urges the *Necessity of Humane Learning*, which I intend to consider in its proper place. Now, if God hath not sent them, if our Saviour Christ hath not committed his blessed Gospel to these men to preach; but they have run *unsent*, and have spoken *uncommanded*, no Wonder that the People are not profited by their Ministry; and the Non-proficiency of the People under that Ministry, must needs be chargeable on such Ministers.

But he sayes, *The Goodness or Badness of the Ministry is to be measured from its agreeableness*

ableness to the divine Institution, and real Tendency to its proper End, the Salvation of Souls, pag. 4.

Answ. Let us compare their Ministry with the Divine Institution, and see how they agree. What he means by Divine Institution, he has not exprest; but that which is generally urged as the Divine Institution, is

Mat. 28. the Words of Christ to his Apostles, *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, &c.* He told them,

in the Verse immediately foregoing, that *All Power was given unto him in Heaven and in Earth*, and thereupon he grounds the Institution, *Go ye therefore, &c.* But before they were thus to go forth to teach, they were to receive the Promise of the Father, as

Chap. 24. *Luke* testifies, *And behold* (said Christ to his Disciples, just before he parted from them) *I*

send the Promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be indued with Power from on high. And accordingly his Disciples did wait for and receive the Promise of the Father, and were indued with Power from on high, before they went forth to preach, as appears in *Acts. 1, & 2.* Now that Ministry that doth not wait to receive

ceive

ceive the Promise of the Father, nor is indued with Power from on high, is *not agreeable* to this Divine Institution, and consequently not the Good Ministry. The Apostle Paul also, unto whom was committed a Dispensation of the Gospel, according to divine Institution, sayes expressly, that *When Christ ascended up on high, he gave Gifts unto men, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body, &c.* Now that Ministry that hath *not received Gifts* from Christ, is *not agreeable* to the Divine Institution, therefore *not* the good Ministry. And that the *English* Ministry (in general) hath *not* received the Promise of the Father, is not endued with Power from on high hath *not* received those Gifts from Christ, their denying the immediate Teaching of the Spirit in this Age, and their constant Recourse to, and Dependance upon Humane Learning and Study, doth sufficiently evince. This Disagreeableness of the present Ministry to divine Institution, is another great Reason why the people are not profited by it.

Again, This Minister sayes, that *Real Profit is Obedience and Ho-*

1 Cor. 9.

17.

Ephes. 4.

8, 12.

pag. 5.

lines

liness of Life; and that the strong-grown Christian measures the Goodness of the Ministry from its Tendency to Conscientious Obedience, that is, (sayes he) the Performance of all Duty in its Latitude, both to God, to Man, and to our selves. Now if the Performance of all Duty in its Latitude, to God, to Man and to our selves, be the Tendency of a good Ministry, how can that Ministry be good which deny, that all Duty, in its Latitude, both to God, to Man, and to our selves can be performed in this Life? Yet that the English Ministry doth deny this, is not only notoriously known, but is also evident from this very Conference, a great part of which is spent to prove the Impossibility of being freed from the Act of Sin in this Life; whereas the least Sin is a Breach of Duty, in some Degree or other, either to God, to Men, or to our selves. Hence I infer, that if the proper Tendency of a true Ministry be (as this Man in words acknowledges) to bring People to such an Uniform, Through, Conscientious Obedience, as amounts to the Performance of all Duty, in its Latitude, both to God, to Man, and to themselves; then cannot this Man's Ministry be true, because it doth not tend to the Performance of

all

all Duty, &c. but on the contrary, by pleading a Necessity of Continuing in Sin, maketh such a Performance of all Duty to be altogether impossible : And this is another grand Reason, why the People are not profited by their Ministry, *the Fault whereof is in the Ministers.*

Besides, they do not minister to the right Part in People, they aim rather at the *Head* than the *Heart*. Thus did not the Ministers of Christ ; they *commended themselves to every man's Conscience in the Sight of God*, as *Paul* testifieth ; and again, *We are made manifest* (saith he) *unto God*, and I trust also are made manifest in your Consciences. So *Peter's* Sermon at *Jerusalem* reacht the Hearts of the Auditors, so that it is said, *They were pricked in their Heart*: This was *Home preaching* ; for that day were added to the Church about *Three Thousand Souls*. But these men now aday s, as they preach from the Strength of *Natural Reason*, and from such Abilities as they can acquire from *Study* and *School-Learning*, so they sute their Matter to reach
and

2 Cor. 4.

2

Chap 5.

11.

Acts 2.

37.

Vers. 41.

and catch the same Part in their Hearers, whose Affections if they can so far gain upon, as to win them to a Subscription to certain plausible and pleasing Notions, the Work is well nigh done, they are thenceforward Believers, but have not that Faith

which overcomes the World,
 I John 5. 4. *and quenches all the fiery Darts*
 Ephes. 6. 16. *of the Wicked.* Now, that

this is the Mark they aim at, hear what this Minister, speaking of the Ministry, pag. 5. *sayes, We must not esteem that most powerful and profitable, which produceth only sensible Consolations, working upon the Tender, and (as he words it) inferior Faculties of the Soul; whereas the strong-grown Christian (such (adds he) as the English Ministry designs to make men) hath his Religion seated in the Rational Powers. Hence the People may plainly see the Reason of their not profiting under this Ministry, namely, because this Ministry designs to seat the Religion even of the grown Christian in the Rational Powers; whereas the People of God in Ages past had their Religion seated in their hearts. The good Ground (in the Parable of the Sower) is by our Saviour*
 Christ

Christ declared to be them, which (not in a wise and knowing Head, not in the rational Powers, as this man speaks, but) in an Honest and Good Heart, Luke 8. having heard the Word, keep it, 15. & bring forth Fruit with Patience.

The Prophet David (speaking of the Righteous) saith, The Law of his

God is in his Heart, none of his Psalm 37.

Steps shall slide. And of him- : 1.

self he sayes, Thy Word have I Psal. 119.

bid in my Heart, that I might 11.

not sin against thee. The Heart

was the spiritual Treasury of Good Men of old, as he well Mat. 12.

knew who said, A Good Man 35.

out of the Good Treasury of his

Heart bringeth forth Good things. Now

these men not being sent of God, not having received the Promise of the Father, not being indued with Power from on high, not ministering as of the Ability which God giveth, but professedly designing to seat the Religion even 'of the strong-grown Christian in the Rational Powers, they cannot reach the heart, they cannot strike the Conscience; Their Teaching is but like that of the Scribes, not having (divine) Authority; whereas the
Preaching

1 Cor. 2. *Preaching of the true Ministers*
 4. 5. *was in Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power, that the Faith of the Hearers might not stand in the Wisdom of Men, but in the Power of God.*

But there is yet another Cause, why the People are not profited by their Ministry, namely, the *Evil Lives* of the Ministers, which this *Priest* gives his *Parishioner* leave to express, perhaps more plainly then he shall have Thanks for, at least from some of his Brethren; for sayes the *Parishioner*, Now
 pag. 11. *that you have put me upon it, I shall give you the true Cause of mens Non-proficiency, and indeed Separation, which is occasioned by the Scandalous Lives of some Ministers, whose Behaviour is such, that they have caused both themselves and Doctrines to stink in the Nostrils of the People. This indeed is something to the Purpose, and to this the Priest thus replies, That there are Scandalous Ministers in the World, is too sad a Truth, and which indeed ought to be lamented in the most Brinish Tears. Let none think the Priest has herein over shot himself, either in the Objection or Answer: For, like a wary man, he probably considered, that it was in vain*

vain for him either to conceal or deny that
 whichever Body knows : His Art therefore
 and Interest it is, by a free Confession, a little
 to paliate, and what in him hes to extenuate
 the Crime, and therein to be sure he will not
 be wanting : For sayes he, *It ought to be*
considered, that in a settled National Ministry
(such as ours is) consisting of great Numbers
in holy Orders, it cannot be expected to be o-
therwise, but that some men for a Corrupt In-
terest, will intrude themselves into these sacred
Offices, which is not to be charged upon our
Function; since there was a Judas amongst the
chosen Twelve.

Answ. Here then as to matter of Fact,
Habemus consistentem reum; we need not seek
 for Evidence, the Priest himself pleads guil-
 ty, acknowledging the scandalous Lives of
 Ministers ; but when in his endeavouring to
 mitigate the Fault, he from their Number
 argues the unavoidableness of it, and saith, *it*
cannot be expected to be otherwise, but that
some men for a corrupt-interest will intrude,
&c. He is so far from mending the Matter,
 that to my Understanding, he makes it much
 worse then it was before ; for by this he ren-
 ders them arrant Hypocrites, Cheats, Im-
 posters, if not something worse by the Simili-
 tude

tude of *Judas*, whom our Saviour Christ called a Devil, *John 6. 70, 71.*

Besides, it is much he should say, these *scandalous Ministers intrude themselves*, seeing all men that know any thing of them, know that according to the Constitution of their Government, none can intrude themselves into their Ministry, but they must be admitted, and have *Letters of Induction* (as I think they term them) from the Bishop, now then the Question naturally rises, *Why would the Bishop admit such Hypocrites into such sacred Offices* (as they call them) and the Answer as naturally follows, *why, he did not know them to be such*: But then alas! may the People well say we are now in worse case then before; for how shall either we or he be assured that *they are not most of them such*? here they are all at a loss: If the People would judge them by their *Fruits* (by which Christ said they should be known, the Priest *Mat. 7. 16. 20.* foreseeing the Danger that would ensue, tells them, by *Fruits* is not meant outward Conversation, though from what immediately follows, viz. *not every one that saith Lord Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doth the Will of my Father,*
 &c.

&c. and again, *Many* will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy Name, &c? and then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me ye that work Iniquity) nothing can be more evident then that *Life* and outward *Conversations* are the *Fruits* intended there by Christ. But sayes the Priest, By *Fruits* are meant the ill consequences of their *Doctrines*, so that he would be sure to put the people upon that Way of Tryal, by which they should be least able to discern; for if those wise and great learned men, who admit these scandalous Preachers, cannot by the ill Consequences of their *Doctrines* discover those corrupt *Interests* for which they intrude themselves, how alas should the ignorant vulgar do it.

But how scandalous soever these *Ministers* are, how corrupt soever the *Interests* for which they intrude, the People, it seems however must hear them, must maintain them. that's the Drift of his Discourse; and because the Quakers think otherwise, he repotes them worse then Page 14. the very Papists, the Reason's obvious, the *Papists* and he jump together, and as with one Voice, endeavour to subject the People to the Clergy, how corrupt, how scandalous
C loever.

soever: Alas poor People ! miserably entral-
 led to their own Servants, whom *Minister a*
 good or bad they must keep, *Servant.*
 how much harder is their Lot (in
 this Case) now, then was that of the primitive
 Christians ! They were not permitted only,
 but exhorted, nay, commanded to *withdraw*
themselves from every Brother that walked
disorderly, 2 Thess. 3. 6. And to the Co-
 rinthians the Apostle is more particular, *I*
1 Cor. 5. 11. have written unto you (saith
he) if any man that is called a
Brother, be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an
Idolater, or a Railer, or a Drunkard, or an
Extortioner, not to keep Company with such an
One, no not to eat: Had the Christians then so
 strict a charge given them to *separate* from
 such *disorderly* Walkers, such *corrupt* and
scandalous Persons (though they had but the
 Name of Brethren) and to see their Con-
 verse, their Company, their Society, as men
 not fit to be eaten with, and must People
 now be tyed up, & fettered to such, and con-
 strained not only to feed with them, but e-
 ven to be fed by them ? Were such then
 thought not worthy to be *convers*t with as
 Brethren, and must they now be *received* and
 admired as *Fathers*, as *Teachers* ! Unhappy
 change:

change : though I have great ground to suspect a man to be a *Fornicator*, though I know him to be *Covetous*, though I fear he is an *Idolater*; though I hear him *rag*, though I see him *drunk* ever and anon, and feel his *Extortion* upon all Occasions, must I notwithstanding acknowledge this man to be a *Minister of Christ*, and have recourse to him for *Teaching*, and Instruction in the divine Mysteries of the Heavenly Kingdom? God forbid. yet take notice how this Priest argues for it.

Page 15. *The Scribes* (saith he) and *Pharisees* were got into *Moses's Chair*, our Saviour bids not the People pull them down, but gives them an eternal [mark the Epithet, *an eternal*] Document, how to behave themselves when such Teachers fall to their Share, viz. *Whatsoever they bid them to observe, that to observe and do, &c. Mat. 23. 3.*

Answer. Here first, it may be worth our noting that the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were got into *Moses's Chair*, not into *Aaron's*: Now *Moses* was the Civil Magistrate, the Judge, or Ruler, but *Aaron* was more properly the Priest; but take it in his Sense, the Chair for the Pulpit, and see his Inference. Our Saviour (he saith) gives the People an E-

*eternal Document, how to behave themselves
 when such Teachers fall to their Share. An E-
 ternal Document! What's that? To do,
 [sayes he] whatsoever they bid them; nay,
 hold there, we have had too much of that al-
 ready; England hath not yet forgot, since
 the Scribes and Pharisees of Rome late in the
 Chair; here, and were forward enough to bid,
 but were the good Men of that Age as rea-
 dy to observe and do? No, no; Our goodly
 Martyrs (by his leave) held not that Docu-
 ment to be eternal, as Smithfield can amply
 witness: And within our own Memory, that
 Chair (as he understands it) was possess'd by
 another Sort of Pharisees, who I am apt to
 think were readier to bid, then ever this man
 himself was to observe, for all his *Eternal
 Document*; But Reader, consider well, if
 God for a Scourge to this provoking Nation,
 should once more suffer the Pope to repossess
 that Chair, how fit an *Instrument* would this
 man be to lead the People into Popery, by se-
 ling them Christ hath given them this eternal
 Document, that whensoever such Teachers
 fall to their share, they must observe and do
 whatsoever those Teachers shall bid them to
 observe, then they must receive the *Sacra-
 ment of the Altar*, then worship the *Host*, then
 pray*

pray to Saints, then pray for the dead, then adore Images, burn Tapers, and what not: nay if the Emaums, which are the Turkish Priests, could get into this Chair, I see no Remedy upon this man's Principle, but Mahomet must be worshipped, but to go on.

He tells us, he is to look at the Water, not at the Conduit through which it is conveyed, page 15.

Ans. But if a man see the Conduit be smeered with Mire and Dirt, will he choose (or is it reasonable he should be tyed) to drink the Water that issues therefrom, when he may as well have it from a cleaner?

Again, he brings the Apostle's Words, we have this Treasure in earthen Vessells, that the Excellency of the Power maybe of Gods, and not of us.

Ans. But had they this Treasure in filthy Vessells? no doubtless; for no Excellency could thence have redounded to God: Earthen Vessells denote Meanness, but are capable of being clean as well as Silver.

But what, saith he, do you think of Judas, and Nicholas the Deacon.

Ans. I think Judas was bad enough, he was one that sold his Master for Money. yet as bad as he was, and as well as he loved the

Bag he did not intrude himself (as it seems some *Priests* for corrupt *Interests*, now adayes do) but he was choen, and had obtained part of the Ministry, from which by Transgression he fell: Now will this Priest say, that *Judas* after he had thus transgressed and fallen, should (if he had lived) have continued in the Ministry? if he saith yes, then may all People see what manner of Ministry this Priest is pleading for. If he says No. I thence infer, that if the Ministers be Corrupt and Wicked, the People are so far from being bound to hear them, that they ought to turn from them, and deny them.

As for *Nicholas* the Deacon, his Office was but to serve Tables, to take Care of the Widows, &c. He was choen to be Overseer of the Poor; and is no where (that I remember) in holy Scripture, taxed with any scandalous Deportment. *Eusebius* indeed reports him to have been the Head of that Sect which in the Revelations is called *Nicolaitars*; but neither one nor t'other says, that he continued his Deaconship after his Defection. However it appears not that he was a publick Preacher.

But the Priest adds, *Solomon you know fell into the grievous Sin of Idolatry, yet for all*
that

that, we burn not his Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles.

Answ. But did Solomon fall into this grievous Idolatry after he writ the.e Books, or before? If it was before, then how knows he but Solomon repented, and turned from his Idolatry, before he writ those Books? *Charity useth to think the best.*

But sayes he to his Parishioner, You cannot but acknowledge, that you have heard many excellent Discourses from the Pulpit, pressing your Respective Duties both to God and Man.

Answ. Ay but, might his Parishioner well have replied, those Discourses made little Impression upon me, when I considered from whom they came. He told me indeed, that I must not be Covetous; yet of all my Acquaintance I knew none more covetous than he. He told me, I must not be drunk, yet I have seen him so too often. He told me, I must live chastly, yet he himself was incontinent. He told me, I must not be Angry, yet none more furious than he. He told me, I must not Swear, yet himself would Swear and Curse too. He told me, I must not Rail, when a great part of his Sermon was made up of Railing. I confess I have heard him say, *The Wicked shall be turned into Hell*; but how

how could I think he believed it to be true, when he was so wicked himself ? For,

*Præcepta mo-
nent Exempla
movent vivuntur
Exemplis.*

Examples are far more powerful then Precepts ; therefore its said, *Præceptis Admonish*, but *Exemplis more* ; And Men are apt to

live by Examples. This the Apostle Paul well knew, and therefore exhorted his Son

Timothy to be an Example of the

1 Tim. Believers, not only in Word, but in

4. 12. Conversation, in Charity, in Spirit, in Faith, in Purity. And his Son

Titus 2. Titus he exhorted, In all things

7. to shew himself a Pattern of Good

1 Pet. 5. Works. The Apostle Peter alio

2, 3. exhorted the Elders to feed the

Flock of God, not as being Lords

over God's Heritage, but being Examples to

the Flock. Examples then we see are very

necessary, and Examples indeed are not

wanting. The Difference lies in this, The

True Ministers were alwayes Examples of

Goodness ; but too many of these Ministers

are Examples of *Evil* : And that's another

Reason why the People are not profited by

them.

But when he cannot clear them of his own

Pro-

Profession, he falls upon the *Quakers*, whom if he can render as bad as his own, he thinks he has done something, therefore he sayes, *If you look narrowly upon the Speakers, many of them make their pretended Holiness a Cloak for Evil Designs.*

Ans. If with all his narrow looking, he could have espy'd those Evil Designs, he should have done well to have discovered them. If he could find none, he has not done well, nor like a *Christian*, much less like a Minister of Christ, to insinuate such a foul Slander, and offer nothing in Proof of it. If he could have given an Instance, 'tis not to be doubted but he would; for his whole Book shews him big with Envy, in which he goes on thus:

And divers of them (sayes he) who have been much admired for a time, have been by the Quakers themselves rejected for arrant Cheats.

Ans. This wants Proof as well as the former; and as he has stated it, I deny it: Yet this I grant, that when any who have walked among us, and made Profession of the same Faith, have swerved from their Integrity, and losing that Sense of the Pow-
er

er of Godliness, which once they had (although retaining something of the Form) have *gone back* again into the spirit of the World, from such I say we have

2 Tim. 3. *turned away*, thereby declaring, 3. We have *No Fellowship* with

them: And be this spoken to the Honour of that *most pure* Principle, which we have received

Ephes. 5. from God, which admits *no Fellowship* with the *unfruitful Works* 11. of *Darkness*, but rather *reproves*

them. And I would have my Antagonist know, that even in this our Religion is highly to be preferred before theirs who *admit* into and *continue* in their sacred Offices (as he calls them) so many *ill-listing* and *scandalous* Priests, who for *corrupt Interests* intrude themselves, as he tells us.

CHAP. II.

Of using the word Thou to a Single Person.

THE next thing the Priest falls upon in his Conference, is our using the word [Thou] to a Single Person. at which he seems offended, and asks, *Whether Religion suffers by saying Thou to a Single Person?* pag. 16.

Ans. We lay not the Stress of our Religion upon Words; yet we know there is a *Form of Sound Words*, and we desire to keep to it. He urges Custom against us; but alas! whence sprang that Custom? In the best of Times, and with the best of Men, Thou and Thee (to a Single Person) was good and inoffensive Language. But as Times grew bad, and men worse, *Pride* and *Flattery* first put Inferiours upon paying a Plural Respect to the Single Person of every Superior, and Superiours upon receiving, and at last requiring it. It was the stile of

France

France at first, as well as any other Countries, to Thou any Person, one spoken to; but when the Common-Wealth of *Rome* turned to an Empire, and so much Power came unto one man's hand, then in regard he was able to confer Honour and Offices, the Countries began to Magnifie him, and

to speak to him in the Plural Number by You, and to Deifie him with Transcending Titles, answered in *Symmachus* his Epistles to the Emperor *Theodosius*, and to *Valentinian*, wherein his stile unto them is, *Vestra Aeternitas*, &c. so that You to a single person, with other Titles and Complements, seems to have its first rise with the *Roman*-Empire, which afterwards descended by degrees upon particular men. And how much it is upheld by *Pride*, & mutually upholds *Pride* at this day, Experience plainly shews. How oft have many been reviled and sciff, how oft abused and beaten for using this proper and harmless word, the use of which he himself acknowledges to be *indifferent*! What spirit is that which thus rages, and smites with the Fist of Wickedness? Is it the humble, meek, gentle Spirit of *Jesus*? or the haughty

haughty, proud, exalted spirit of *Lucifer*? It is easie to judge from what spirit that Custom (of saying Thou to one) at first arose, by the spirit that appears in it at this day, and the Wayes he takes to uphold it. How does the *haughtry ambitious* Mind swell, and disdain to be spoken to in the other Dialect! What, I pray, does this bespeak, but *Pride* and *Arrogance*? And doth not then the upholding that Custom uphold *Pride*, and the *upholing Pride cause Religion to suffer*? He magnifies Custom, and builds all upon it; but I *impeach* that Custom it self, as nourishing and cherishing *that* in man which is *not* of the Heavenly Father's planting, and therefore *must be plucked up*. Let the *Ax* therefore be laid to the *Root* of this Custom, which is, *Pride, Ambition, Haughtiness, Flattery*; and no further Controversie will ever sprout from it.

To the Objection, that God said Thou to *Adam*, and *Adam* said Thou to God, he answers thus; *Do you suppose that God and Adam discoursed in English? If the Translators had used You for Then, this Shadow of an Objection had disappeared* (perhaps he would have said [*not appeared*] for disappeared implies an appearance first.)

Ans. w.

Ans. This is a weak Shift: Though God and *Adam* did not discourse in *English*, yet the *Hebrew* Tongue (in which it is supposed they did discourse, and in which the Discourse is penn'd) is not defective of Numbers, but hath the Singular and the Plural as distinct as the *English*. If therefore the Translators had used You for Thou, instead of One Objection, there would have been Two; the same that now is, and another against the Translation as false.

The rest of his Discourse upon this Subject leans wholly upon Custom. Custom has taught them to say You to a Man that loves to be Flattered: but God regard not Flattery, and therefore they say Thou to him still. And in all Spiritual Relations and Religious Offices, he confesse, *Thou's the fittest Word to be us'd*; and if it be high enough for God and Spiritual Affairs, I see not how it should be too low for Man and Temporal Affairs.

To conclude therefore (because I would not be long where he is short) I shall leave it to the conscientious Consideration of every unprejudiced Reader, whether that Dialect which God is pleased to accept, that wherein he hath been pleased to deliver himself,

self, that which all the holy Prophets, our blessed Saviour, his Apostles, and all Good Men, in the best Times, did express themselves by, is not fitter for a *Christian* now to use, then that which depends only upon a Custom, sprung up out of the *Purification of Corrupt Times*.

But if any desire to be satisfied further concerning this Subject, I refer them to two Books, the Title of one being, *No Cross No Crown* (p. 6.) That of the other, *A Serious Apology for the Principles and Practices of the People called Quakers* (p. 143.) in both which they may find it more copiously handled.

CHAP. III.

Of Titles and Civil Respects, as they are called.

FROM Propriety of Language he comes next to Civil Respects (as he calls them) wherein he deals very injuriously with us; for whatever he has a mind to fasten upon us, that he makes his *Parishioner* speak, and then him-

himself infers whatever he thinks will render us ridiculous. For instance, in page 24. After he has through a Series of Discourse brought his *Parishioner* to say, *Possibly I have been faulty in suffering my Servants to call me Master*, he by and by draws this inference, *So then (sayes he) the Quakers bring this Tenent to this strange Result, that a Child must Honour his Father, but not call him Father; that a Servant must obey his Master, but not call him Master.* Which Tenent to be his own, not ours, our Writings and Practices sufficiently evidence. Again, p. 26. He asks his *Parishioner* thus, *Do you suppose that Text, Luke 10.4. Salute no man by the Way, is to be taken in a literal sense?* To which he makes the *Parishioner* reply, *I suppose it is;* and thereupon he confidently infers, *Then the Quakers are faulty, and highly to be blamed.* Why, what are the *Quakers* concerned in the *Parishioner*? What's he to them, or they to him? Oh, sayes the Priest, *He is inclining to Quakerism;* and more See his Ti- ing to Quakerism; and more the Page. then that, *He approves of some Quakers,* p. 19. What then? is that sufficient to intitle the *Quakers* to whatsoever Absurdities an Envious Priest has

a mind to cast upon them? Observe, Reader, the Injustice of this man, who from a bare Supposition of *his own suggesting* to a Parishioner of *his own making*, adventures to charge a Fault and Blame upon all the *Quakers* in general. What Man or People after this way of writing, might he not Abuse and Traduce?

But as he hath dealt dishonestly with us, so has he also befool'd himself; for he makes the Parishioner for nine or ten pages together, contend with him *against Respecting Persons*, forgetting that at their very first congress, he brought in the very same Parishioner speaking to him thus, *Take it not for Flattery, if I tell* page 3. *you, that the Respects which I bear to your Person, are most sincere and cordial.* What thinkest thou, Reader? Did the Priest remember his *Decorum* here? Was this a fit Person to represent the whole Body of the *Quakers*, and dispute *against Respecting Persons*? Nay, does it not look like a Design laid to *mistake* our Principles, and *misrepresent* us to the World? But our Confidence is in the Lord our God, whose Truth we are engaged to defend. Let us therefore go on,
D
and

and see what Strength our Adversary hath brought forth.

The Parishioner, after his solemn Respect to the Priest's Person, urges against Respect of Persons, those words of the

*Jam. 2. Apostle James, My Brethren, have
1,2,3,4. not the Faith of our Lord Jesus*

*Christ, the Lord of Glory, with
Respect of Persons, &c. This, sayes the*

*Priest. is not meant of Civil Respect, but such
sort of Respect only, as did violate Justice in*

*their publick Consistories, when the gaity and
outward splendor of the Rich tempted them to*

*partiality; and to give such a Sentence as a-
greed not with the Merit of the Cause, p.21.*

Ans. That this was not the Apostle's
Drift, let it be considered to whom he writ,

namely, to the Twelve Tribes that were
scattered abroad, which cannot reasonably be

supposed to be the whole People or Political
Body of the *Jews*, but such of them as had

received the *Christian Faith*, as the Text
in Controversie plainly shews, *My Brethren,*

*have not the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ
with Respect of Persons.* This also *B. 24*

well observes in his Marginal Notes upon the
place, *Fidelitatem omnibus Judaeis* (sayes he)

enjusferat;

ejusq; Tribus suis, per terrarum Orbem dispersis: i. e. To all the Faithful Jews, of what Tribe soever: they are, dispersed throughout the World. Which dispersion may not improbably relate to that great Persecution, which, upon Stephen's Death, was raised against the Acts 8.1. Church at Jerusalem, by means of which the Believers there were all scattered abroad through the Regions of Judea and Samaria. Now this being premised, consider, Reader, what Consistories, or Courts of Judicature, these poor scattered Believers could then have, who being exiled (as it were) from their chap. 11. own, travailed through other 19. Countries to preach the Word.

But he sayes, *This supposition* (for he maketh no more of it) *namely, that by Assemblies the Apostle here means Places of Judgements, will appear to be well grounded, when we consider that the Jews had a Law, whereby it was provided, that when a Rich Man and a Poor had a Suit together in their Courts of Judicature, either both must Sit, or both stand in the same rank, to avoid all Marks*

of Partiality: To the Terms of which Law the Apostle here has reference, p. 22.

Ans. He had done but his part to have quoted his Authority for this Law. If such a Law the *Jews* had, whence had they it? If it had been given them of God, doubtless we should have found it amongst those Laws which they received from him. If it was not from God, but an Invention and Tradition of their own, it is altogether improbable that the Apostle of Jesus Christ would have any reference thereunto, especially writing to those who were then coming off, not only from the Traditions of the *Jewish* Elders, but even from the whole *Jewish* Polity.

Besides, If this Law was but a Sanction of their own (which, for ought I yet see, it must be, or be nothing) The *Jews* were so superstitiously Zealous for the Traditions of their Fore Fathers, that it is no way likely they would so positively violate a Law of their making. He says, The Law was, that the Parties to the Cause must either *both Sit*, or *both Stand in the same rank*; whereas here, the one is said to *sit*, and the other to *stand*, and so *not both sit*; or the one to sit in a good Place,

Place, and the other under the Footstool, and so not both in the same rank. This had been directly to thwart their own Tradition (if this Law he speaks of was a Tradition of theirs) a thing they were seldom guilty of: for they too often preferred their own Traditions even to the Law of God.

But sayes he, The Apostle could not mean by Assemblies Civil Meetings, because he then had contradicted what his Lord had plainly allowed, Luke 14. 8, 9, 10. When thou art bidden of any man to a Wedding, sit not down in the highest Room, lest a more honourable man then thou be bidden, &c. Where (he sayes) Difference and Degrees of Honour and Place are evidently allowed by our Saviour, &c.

Ans. For the right Understanding of this Scripture, it must be considered in what *time*, and to *whom* these words were spoken. For the *time*, it was under the Law, before the One Offering was actually offered up. That was an *Outward* State, the People of God was then an *Outward* National People, their Religion and Worship was much *outward* and shadowy, their Wars were *outward*, their Ornaments were *outward*, their Honours and Respects to one another were *outward*.

- And in this State many things were indulged to the Jews, many things permitted and connived at, partly because of the *Hardness* of their *Hearts*, and partly by reason of their *Weakness*. But this State was to last but *till the Time of Reformation*; and when the Time of Reformation was fully come, these things grew out of Use.
- Mat. 19. 8.* Old things were done away, all things became new. That People were put away (from being the People of God upon those former Considerations) and He is the True Jew now, which is one inwardly, whose Praise is not of Men (he regards not the Honour and Respect which men give) but of God. That Outward Worship is laid aside, and now the true Worship is (neither in the Mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, but) in Spirit and in Truth. The outward Wars were ended, as to Christians; the Swords were beaten into Plow-shares, and Spears into Pruning-hooks.
- Hebr. 9. 10.*
- 2 Cor. 5. 17.*
- Rom. 2. 28, 29.*
- John 4. 21, 22, 23.*
- Isa. 2. 4.*
- Mic. 4. 3.*

books (as was long before prophesied of the Gospel State) And said the Apostle Paul, *The Weapons of our Warfare are not Carnal, but Spiritual, and Mighty through God.* The Outward Ornaments were put off, the *Plating of Hair, the Embroideries and Gold;* and the Ornament used instead thereof, is that which is *not corruptible, even the Ornament of a Meek and Quiet Spirit, which is in the Sight of God of great price.* The Outward Honour also went off with the rest, and they that received the Faith of Christ Jesus, sought *the Honour which cometh from God only.* The Praise of the True Jew was of God, not of Man. Thus much of the Time when those Words of Christ were spoken, and the Difference between that Time and this.

Now of the Persons to whom they were spoken, if we consult the Place we shall find they were the *Pharisees, and Interpreters of the*

2 Corin
10. 4.

2 Pet. 3.
3, 4.

John 5.
44.

Rom. 2.
29.

Luke 14. 1, 3. the Law, whom he met with
 in the House of one of the
 chief *Pharisees* where they were invited to
 eat, and the Occasion of his putting forth
 this Parable to them was, *He marked how*
they chose out the chiefest Roomes or
ver. 7. Seats. this it seems was the *Phari-*
saeal *Ich* then, as appears further in *Mat.*
23. 6. I with the *Pharisees* of this Age were
 not overrun with the same now amongst that
 Sort of men, there were several Ranks or
 Degrees, there were *chief Pharisees*, and *in-*
feriour Pharisees, and they took place one of
 another, some being accounted more honour-
 able then others; nay there were no less then
Moses & Aaron Seven Ranks amongst the
l. 1. c. 10. *Pharisees*, as *Goodwin* tells
 us; nor wanted there
 Ranks among the *Lawyers* also; now our
 Saviour seeing how they chose out the best
 Places for themselves, had a fair Opportu-
 nity given him to nip their Ambition and Folly,
 by shewing them that if another that were of
 a Rank above them should come in, the
 chief *Pharisee*, who was Master of the Feast,
 would turn them down with Disgrace, and
 they must with Shame give place to another
 that had a broader *Phylactery* then their own;
 this

this was *Argumentum ad hominem*, very close and home to those perking Pharisees, who so doted upon receiving outward Honour one from another, that it is mentioned as a Ground of their Unbelief; but what was this to his own Disciples? did he ever instruct them after this manner? No such matter; he puts them in mind of their Equality, by telling them *Mat. 23. 8.* they were Brethren; and when a little hankering after Superiority began to steal in upon them, he stricks it dead at one Blow, by telling them, *Though the Gentiles exercise Authority over one another, yet it shall not be so among you, but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.* *Luke 22. 24, 25, 26.*

From what hath been said it appears, that those Words of Christ in *Luk. 14.* were not spoken with relation to the times of the Gospel, nor, directed to his Disciples, so that the Words of the Apostle James may still (without any contradiction to his Master) be reasonably understood, as a general prohibition of that vain and evil Custom of respecting Persons upon any Occasion whatsoever; and indeed the Apostle's manner of speech im-

plies

plies no less, being much like that which Christ spake to the Jews, John 5. 44. *How can ye believe which receive Honour one of another, and seek not the Honour that cometh from God only?* where our Saviour seemeth to make their receiving Honour one of another an *Hindrance to believing*; and the Apostle tells them that do believe, they must not think to hold the Faith of Christ Jesus, and respect of Persons together, as if he had plainly said, *they are inconsistent.*

The next Scripture he touches upon is, *Mat. 23. 10. Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ,* upon this he abuses us at his pleasure, and by his *absurd and idle reasoning*, would fasten this *Foppery* upon us, that a Child must honour his Father, but must not call him Father, that a Servant must obey his Master, but must not call him Master, which ridiculous conceit of his is so evidently contradicted by our universal Practice that whosoever hath convers'd almost with any of us, is able to give a *Check* thereto, though I should say nothing of it, yet, lest he should grow *wise in his own Conceit*, if no further answer be given, I add this.

Ans. We are not ignorant either of the
Intention

Intention, or Occasion of those Words of Christ, as little Learning as this man is willing to allow us: That Christ did condemn the use of the Word Father, as it implied an implicit Faith in them to whom it was so given; and also the Word Master, as it denoted the chief or head of a Sect or Party, we grant; but this was not all, *he also condemned the Use of those Titles [Master and Father] in every Sense wherein there is not a true Relation*: Now for a Child to call his Parents Father and Mother; for a Servant to call him Master, whose Servant indeed he is, this is just and reasonable; for here is betwixt them a *Real Relation*, which makes these Titles necessary and *true*, but for one man to call another man Father, who he knows is not his Father in any Relation, either by Nature or Law, this is condemned by Christ, and how indeed can it otherwise be? for it is a direct *Untruth*, which is contrary to his Nature: And besides the evil of it (which were it no more then an *idle Word*, and idle that must needs be, which hath no Signification nor Service, *an Account must be given for it*, the Absurdity of it is most gross; for by the same Reason that I may call any one man, father, who indeed is not so to me, I may call

two

two, ten, an hundred so, nay every man I meet; from Father let us turn to Master, and see how the case stands there. If it be evil for me to call another man Father, who is not really my Father, and that because I should therein speak untrue, doubtless it is as evil for me to call another man Master, who is not really my Master, because I should therein speak untrue also, yet this is the common Case: Since *Vanity and Flatter* have prevailed upon the World, and Mens *Tongues have been unbridled*, they frequently, and *fawningly*, call them Masters for whom they do no Service, to whom they acknowledge none to be due from them; and who never expect any of them; this we say is condemned by Christ, this *conscientiously* we refuse, and are witnesses against; in short therefore Titles of *true* Relation we own, and use, but *empty* Titles, Titles *without Relation* we disown and reject, as being indeed but Titles of *Flattery*, which we dare no more make use of, then that good

Job 32. man who said of old, *Let me not I*
 21, 22. *pray you accept any man's person,*
neither let me give flattering Titles unto man;
for I knew not to give flattering Titles, in so
doing my maker would soon take me away.

I should now have done with this Subject, but that the Priest offers some Examples from both old and new Testament, I shall take notice of those only which he brings from the new, as nearer to the purpose, having before shewed the Difference between the States of the old Testament and the new.

He saith, *St. Luke dedicating his Gospel to Theophilus, salutes him with the Title of most excellent Theophilus, chap. 1. 3. And St. Paul to Festus an Heathen, addresseth himself with the Title of most noble Festus, Acts 25. 26.*

Ans. These are not properly *Titles*, but *Epithets* (as wise, learned, patient, merciful, just and the like) which might be used without *Flattery* to the Persons, if they to whom they were used were *truly* excellent or noble (for the greek Word is the same in both) But more particularly to the first, We find the same *Luke* did afterwards to the same *Theophilus*, dedicate his Treatise of the *Acts of the Apostles*, without any, either Title or Epithet at all, but barely thus, *The former Treatise have I made, O Theophilus, and yet this was written after the other, in his riper years,* *Acts 1. 1.*
and

and when he had made a *further Progress* in the Christian Religion, and none I Hope will think so good a man went from *better to worse*. 2dly, As for *Paul's Address to Festus* (which is the same with *Luke's xpartists* in both) and might as well have been rendred most excellent, he had Reason to use it to him; for in Justice and courteous Deportment, he excelled all other Magistrates, that *Paul* had been brought before.

But the Priest adds, *That Paul did not ascribe Agrippa of his Royal Titles, but call'd him King.*

Answ. *Agrippa* was a King, and the Title related to his Office, therefore *Paul* might well give it; and it is observable, he gave it barely, he did not add *most Sacred Majesty, Dread Sovereign*, or the like: But seeing *Paul* said only *King Agrippa*,¹ and that *Agrippa* was the Name, and only *King* the Title, I see not how this man will make Titles of one Word, unless by the same Figure whereby he makes *one Man two*, that he may say you to him.

Another Instance he brings of *Barnabas* and *Paul*, crying among the People, *Sirs, why do ye these things?* Acts 14. 15.

Answ. The place is mis-rendered. The
Greek

Greek word is *Andres*, Beza's Latin *viris* from both which it ought to be read, *Men*, why do ye these things?

But St. John, he sayes, writes to the *Eld^r Lady*.

Ans^r. Who she was, in what Relation John stood to her, or how far her Temporal Power might extend, does not appear. But this is certain, that John was a Plain, Simple, Down-right Man, not addicted to flatter or complement any, as may well appear by the Stile of the Epistle, wherein he frequently uses the honest plain Language of *Tise* to her. So that this I take for granted, that he used not the Title of *Lady* (which yet signifies no more then *Mistress* or *Dame*) as a meer empty, vain or flattering Title, devoid of all Relation; since so to have done had not been right and sound, as I have shew'd before. And that it was not his manner to give Titles, where there was no just Ground or Relation for them, may appear from his third Epistle, where writing to *Gaius*, he does not call him *Rabbi* or *Master Gaius*, but simply sayes, *The Elder unto the Well beloved Gaius*. If therefore the Priest will have it, that John gave the Title of *Lady* in complement only, let him prove it.

Sarah

Sarah (he sayes) *was commended by Peter, not only for obeying Abraham, but also for calling him Lord, 2 Pet. 3. 6.*

Answe. *Abraham had a Lordship or Power over her, as he was her Husband: She acknowledg'd it in obeying his Commands. Here was Government and Subjection; and Lord (or Master, which imports the same) was a relative Title to it.*

I have now done with this Head. But before I pass to the next, I must take a little Notice of a Passage of his, which although it relate not directly to this Matter, yet may pertinently be applyed to another: It is this, *You must know* (sayes he, pag. 25.) *that the Scribes and Pharisees had so far incroacht upon Christ's Prophetick and Regal Offices, that they had usurped an absolute Authority and Dominion over the Faith and Consciences of Men; imposing the Traditions and Invention of their own Brains, as so many absolute Laws in the Church of God.* From these words of his may be observed, *First, That Authority and Dominion over men's Faith and Consciences are the Prophetick & Regal Offices of Christ.* 2. *That the Imposing of the Traditions and Inventions of*
me ns

mens own Brains, as so many absolute Laws in the Church of God, is an *Usurping Authority* and Dominion over the Consciences of men. 3. That they who so *Usurp Authority* and Dominion over the Faith and Consciences of men, do *Infringe* upon the Prophetick and Regal Offices of Christ. 4. That they who thus *Infringe*, are not *Christians*, but *Scribes* and *Pharisees*.

Another Saying he has somewhat to the same purpose, a little lower, where speaking of a Father after the Spirit, to whom we are subject in all things which concern the Spirit, he adds, For of our Souls, Spirits and Consciences, as we can have no Father, so we can have no Master upon Earth, pag. 26. Whence I take it to be a fair Consequence, That no man upon Earth hath Power to impose any thing upon the Conscience of another. But this being beside my present Business, let it suffice to be only hinted in *transcursu*, as it were, and by the by.

CHAP. IV. of Confession.

FROM contending for empty and vain Titles, he comes in the next place to Confession of Sin, and that not without very good Reason: for if as the *Prov. 10.* Wise Man (aid) *In the Multitude of Words there wanteth not Sin;* doubtless in a Multitude of Idle, Vain, Flattering and Untrue Words, Sin must much abound, But *Confessing*, unless he also forsake, will stand him in little stead.

In the Mannagement of his Discourse on this Head, he makes his *Parishioner* a meer Baby, that he may throw him down the more easily. For, the *Parishioner* obj-cting That they Confess themselves miserable sinners, He asks, *Whether Confession of Sin be the Duty of every humble Penitent?* The *Parishioner* grants it is a Duty. Then, says the Priest, *the sum of your Accusation lies here, that we live in the practice of a known Duty,*

Dut., p. 29. Hereupon he makes his *Pa-*
ssion break off thus, *I confess I took up*
this Argument too hastily.

Ans. And as hastily he lets it fall. But
 let us rightly state the Case: That it is the
 Duty of every humble Penitent to Confess
 his Sins, is not doubted; but the Question
 is, Whether a constant *Course* of Confes-
 sing be a Duty? for that implies a constant
Course of Sinning: Whereas we know, that
 bare Confessing of Sins without Forsaking
 them, avails little. But it is *He that Con-*
fesses and Forsakes them, that shall
have Mercy: for if we thus *Prov.* 28.
Confess, God is faithful and just 13.
to forgive us our Sins. Now then 1 John 1.
 the Question is, Whether it be 9.

our Duty to Confess from day to
 day, from year to year, that we are still
 guilty of those Sins, which, by the Assistance
 of God's Grace, we have forsaken, and
 which God hath forgiven to us? But if this
 be so far from being a Duty, that it would be
 a Sin in us so to Confess, because that Con-
 fession would be false; let us then consider
 further, that *If we truly Confess, and* (as I
 said before) by the Help of Divine Grace,
Forsake our Sins, God is Faithful and Just,

not only to forgive us our Sins, but also to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness, 1 John 1. 9. Now they who are thus cleansed by God from all Unrighteousness, is it their Duty still to say, They are Miserable Sinners? That would be to speak Untruth, which I am sure is no man's Duty. The

Ephes. 5. Ephesians were sometimes Dark-
8. *ness; but now (saith the Apostle*
to them). ye are Light in the

Lord: Had it been their Duty to have said,
No, we are still Darkness? Some among
the Corinthians (before their Conversion)

had been Fornicators, Idolaters,
1 Cor. 6. Adulterers, Covetous, Drunk-
9, 10, *ards &c. Paul sayes to these*
11. *Corinthians, Such indeed some of*

you were; but ye are Wash'd, but
ye are Sanctified, but ye are Justified (from
these things) in the Name of the Lord Jesus,
and by the Spirit of our God. Had it been
the Duty of these Corinthians, after they
were thus washed, sanctified and justified from
those gross Sins, to have said, We are such
still; We are Fornicators still, Idolaters still,
Adulterers still, Thieves still, Covetous still,
Drunkards still? This had been the Way to
have made themselves Lyars too (which be-
fore

fore was not charged upon them) in denying the Work of God.

Let us consider further, If this customary and *common Road* of Confessing be a Duty (as the Priest would have it) whom is it a Duty to? Is there but One Lesson for all Degrees? The Little Children, the Young Men, the Fathers and Elders (mentioned in *John's 1st Epistle*) What! are they all in one Form? When they first come into this School, their Confession is but Miserable Sinners: and must they be saying the same Lesson so long as they continue in the School? What! no Proficiency, no Improvement, no going forward! Surely it is not so in the School of Christ. But in this School he that comes in at Sixteen Years of Age, does but confess himself a Miserable Sinner, and the same Man, if he live till Sixty or more, confesses himself a Miserable Sinner still. So that after he has travailed Forty or Fifty Years upon this Road, after he has spent his Age in this School, if he be measured by his own Confession, he is not one step nearer his Journey's end, he is *no whit better* then when he first came in, and therefore worse.

In short then, let this be the Issue of this

Discourse: Though it be every man's Duty, when he is *overtaken with a Sin*, humbly and penitently to confess his sin to Almighty God, yet it is not the Duty of any Man, to propose to himself a constant and *common Course* of Confession, because whosoever doth so, must first propose to himself a constant and *common Course* of sinning; but no constant and *common Course* of sinning being allowed, it cannot reasonably be supposed, that a constant and *common Course* of Confession is required.

CHAP. V. Of Perfection.

THat he may never want Occasion to Confess Sin, his next work is, to plead the Continuation of Sin, which he doth in Opposition to the Doctrine of Perfection.

Great indeed hath been the Opposition this Doctrine of Perfection hath met withal, from the Hands of most sorts of men, since the time it was first preach't in this latter Age of the World. Some through *Ignorance*
mi-

mistaking it: Others through *Interest* Re-
viling and Gainsaying it, as foreseeing it de-
structive to their *Trade* and Profit: And ve-
ry many rejecting it for the *Straightness* of
the Way, because they saw their beloved
Lusts and they could never walk together
in it; but that they must part with their
most *pleasing* Vanities, and forever abandon
the Company of their *dearest* Delilahs, if
they would be really and indeed (not in
Name only and Profession) Disciples and
Followers of Holy Jesus.

Yet because in all Undertakings *Perfection*
is *desirable*, and aimed at, my Opponent is
wary how he wholly denies it: We deny not
(sayes he, pag. 30.) the *Doctrine* of *Perfec-*
tion, but such a *Notion* as the Quakers have
thereof, calling it, an *Unsinning State*.

Ans. A *Perfection* then it seems he is
for; but it is to be perfect in a *state* of *sinning*:
for in an *Unsinning State* he denies it. What
kind of *Notion* has he got of *Perfection*, who
would be perfect, yet a *Sinner*?

He then goes on to open the Words of
Christ, *Be ye therefore Perfect,*
even as your Father which is in Mat. 5.
Heaven is Perfect. In which 48.
Words he sayes, our Lord aims

only

only, from God Almighty's Example, to
press Charity and Mercy to the highest De-
gree, pag. 3.

Ans. Charity and Mercy to the *highest*
 Degree! Did he consider what he writ? or
 how he should be able to maintain it? He is
 got *so high* at the first step, that the *Quakers*
 had need help him down again. The *highest*
 Degree of Charity and Mercy is applicable
 only to God Almighty: we don't aspire *so*
high. We desire our Charity and Mercy
 may be *real, true, sincere*, of the same *Nat-*
ure, Kind, Quality with God's; but we
 expect it not in the same *Degree* or *Fab-*
ric that's peculiar to God himself.

The *Parishianer* adds another Scripture,
 intimating that we are comman-
 ded to be *Holy as God is Holy*; *1*
Pet. 1. 16. *and if we could not be unspinningly*
perfect and holy, in vain (sayes
 he) *is the Precept propounded to us.* To this
 he replies, *Could you rightly distinguish be-*
tween Equality and Similitude, your Obje-
ction would disappear in a Moment, pag. 33.

Ans. If he had rightly distinguished be-
 tween Equality and Similitude in his opening
 the former Text, he had not then fallen into
 the *Error* he did, in construing Christ's
 Words

Words to intend the *highest* Degree of Charity and Mercy, which relates to *Equality* (for he that could attain the Highest Degree of Charity and Mercy, would in Charity and Mercy be equal with the Highest) nor had he now incurr'd the *Absurdity* of being inconsistent with himself.

But he ran not more to the one hand before, then he runs to the other now; for having light on the *Distinction* between *Equality* and *Similitude*, he inveighs most fiercely against an *unfinning* Perfection, as if to be delivered and preserved from Sin, were to *vis* Perfections with the Creator. *ibid.*

Ans. Did *Adam* *vis* Perfections with his Creator, when he was in an *unfinning* State of Perfection? Nothing less: for even in that State of *pure* Innocency, *unstained* with any *Spot* of Sin, *Adam* had not an *Equality* with God, although he was in his *Similitude*. He was made in the *Likeness* of God, not *equal* to him. But if no other Instance of this could be given, yet *Adam's* Capacity of *sinning* (which the divine Nature is utterly *insusceptible* of) was a sufficient Token of his *Inequality*. Hence I infer, That to aim at and press after a State of being, in this Life, delivered from Sin, and by the

the Mighty Power of God preserved from the Act, Commission and Guilt of Sin (which is what we intend by the word Perfection) is no Presumption, no *vying* Perfections, no aspiring to an *Equality* with the divine Majesty.

And verily Reader, I cannot but (upon this Occasion) express the Sense of my own Heart simply and nakedly: 'Tis the Belief of my Heart, that the Lord is so far from being offended with any, for sincerely pressing after this State of Holiness and Purity: that he loves his Children so much the more, by how much the more they resemble him herein; and sure I am, the more they come out of sin and Iniquity, & the more they grow up in Righteousness, and true Holiness, the nearer they approach unto his Likeness, and bear the more of his Image, which, even this Priest in words will allow, saying, *Tough we cannot equal* (which we aim not at) yet *we may imitate the divine Perfections*, and that indeed we press after.

But he attempts to illustrate his meaning by a familiar instance, as he calls it, *A writing Master sets his Schollar a Copy with a Charge to imitate it; you must only construe his meaning to be such, that he must frame his Letters according*

according to the Form of those Characters, which are set before him, and not that he expects he should write according to the Perfection of his Copy.

Ans. Let me now shew him that his instance, (as familiar as he thinks it is) is no way apt to his purpose; for the Writing Master, if he be ingenuous and honest, not only expects, but endeavours also what in him lies, that his Schollar may arrive to the Perfection of the Copy, and this the Scholar oftentimes doth, yea sometimes outdoes or excels, at least is capable of so doing: But this is no way predicable of man in his imitation of divine Perfections; his instance therefore is unapt to the Business; but if he will grant me, that Sin, Iniquity and Transgression are the Stains, the Blots, the Blurs of man's Life, and also that it is possible for a Scholar to keep his Lines strait, and to write fairly without Blots and Blurs, though he should miss of that lively vigour, and sprightfulness, which appears in the Letters of his Master's Copy, I shall not think it an uneasy matter even from his own instance, to infer a possibility of living without Sin.

Before I pass from this Place, there are two or three Scriptures which my Opponent hath

hath quoted (I suppose to corroborate or strengthen his instance) which seem to me so pertinent to my Purpose, that I am willing to transcribe them out of his Book into mine, and let the Reader make what use of them he pleases; they are brought in thus, *Therefore sayes he, Christ tells me, John 13. 15. That he hath given us an Example to do as he hath done, that is (saith the Priest) to purifie our selves as he is pure, 1 John 3. 3. to walk as he walked, and to be holy in all manner of conversation, because he was so. What is this les then an Unsinning State? But I proceed,*

From the former instance we must now go to instances of another kind; for to that Pass is the world now come, that although the necessity of this State, of being preserved out of Sin, be *evidently demonstrated*, the Advantages accrewing therefrom, *clearly set forth*, and the Commands requiring it, *plainly produced*, yet so prevalent are the *Baits* of Lust and sinful Pleasures, on the degenerate Minds of men, and so long have they been *nursed up* in a Perswasion, that they can never be freed from Sin on this Side the Grave, that rather then they will believe a Possibility of Deliverance in this Life, they will not stick

stick to reflect an Uncertainty on the holy Scriptures as if they meant not what they express, and call for proofs of another kind, Examples namely, and instances of some in Ages past, who have attained this State of Freedom; and yet when instances of this kind are given, such and so great is the incredulity of men (in this Case especially) that they will hardly admit those instances to have been, what in holy Scripture they are declared to be; thus deals this man with us. *The Instances brought in his Book are, Noah, Job and David, three good men doubtless; Of Noah the Testimony of the holy Ghost is, That he was just and perfect in his Generation, and that he walked with God. Of Job that he was perfect and upright, and that he feared God and eschewed Evil. Of David, that he was a man after God's own Heart, Acts 13. 22.*

Now to blemish Noah's Perfection, the Priest objects that he was drunk and uncovered in his Tent, Gen. 9. 20, 21.

Ans. Noah walked with God before this, and I will not stick to say after this also, this I grant was his Sin, and while he was in his Sin, while he was drunk, he did not walk with God; what was his State then while he did walk

walk with God, both before and after this? did he ever fall into Sin again? let the Accuser of the Brethren charge him with Evil if he can.

To stain the beauty of Job's Perfection, he objects, that Job in one Place confesseth, *I have sinned*, and in another saith, *Behold I am vile*, Job 7. 20. & 40. 4.

Ans. The 1st. [*I have sinned*] speaks of a time past not present. The 2^d. [*I am vile*] doth not imply that he was *sinful*; for although the word [*vile*] is often used in English to signifie wicked, yet the Latine Word [*vilis*] doth not properly signifie wicked, or *sinful*, but cheap, Mean, Small, of little Account, &c. therefore we find in Scripture that where the Word *vile* is used to signifie wicked or *sinful*, it is not taken from *vilis*, but from *sceleratus*, *flagitiosus*, *scelus*, &c. as in Judges 19. 24. *Do not so vile a thing*; Jerome reads it, *Ne Scelus hoc operemini*. Tremel. *No facite quicquam hujus Flagitij*. So Isa. 32. 6. *A vile Person will speak Villany*, Tremel. hath it, *Flagitiosus dicitur flagitium eloquens*. Again, Rom. 1. 26. *God gave them up unto vile Affections*, Beza reads it, *Tradidit eos Deus sceleris Affectionibus*, but when *vile* is used to denote mean, low, of small Account, &c. it is taken from *vilis*, *humilis*, or the like, as
in

in *1st Sam. 15. 9.* Every thing that was vile and
 & use, that they utterly destroyed, *Jerom.* has
 it, *Quauid vero vile fuit et reprobum, hoc de-*
moluitur. So *2 Sam. 6. 22.* I will be yet
 more vile then slau, In *Jerom:* it is, *Vilior fi-*
am plusquam factus sum. Lament. 1. 11. I
 am become vile, *facta sum vilis,* sayes *Jer.*
Me vile pendit, Tremel. Again, *Phil 3. 21.*
Who shall change our vile Body. Beza reads
 it, *Qui transformabis Corpus nostrum humile;*
 and in this Sense it is that *Job* said he was vile,
 that is mean, low, little to be regarded com-
 paratively. and in respect of God (as Tremel.
 expounds it, using the Word *vilis*) but *Jer.*
 reads it, *Qui leviter locutus sum,* who have
 spoken flatterly, or little to the Purpose.

But suppose nothing of this kind could
 have been said in *Job's* defence, but that the
 words had been as full to the Disfamation of
Job, as the Priest himself could with; yet
 would it not seem strange, & very hard mea-
 sure, that from two such Expressions (spo-
 ken much about the same time) a Conclusion
 should be drawn against *Job,* That he was
 never free from Sin all the dayes of his Life?
 What if in his sore Afflictions (such as we
 do not find did ever befall any man but him-
 self) he had a Slip, a Failing, is that enough
 to

to blemish so remarkably good a Life as his ?
 or can it thence be fairly interr'd, that he was
 not delivered and kept from Sin in the pre-
 cedent and subsequent parts of his Life ?
 Let this be spoken for the Honour of Job
*(but much more to the Glory of him who pre-
 served him)* That the Devil himself could
 not pick a Hole in his Coat, though *this*
Priest has endeavoured to do it. He who is
 the Author of Sin, and whose main Business
 it is to tempt to Sin, none I suppose will ima-
 gine him ignorant who commits sin, and who
 nor. Now when God proposed Job to Satan

as a perfect and upright man, one
 Chap. 1. that feared God and eschewed E-
 vers. 8. vil, can we suppose, that if Sa-
 tan had had any Sin to sling at

him, he would not have readily
 flung it, especially considering
 how particular his Enmity was at
 Job ? But instead of that, what

Verf. 10. sayes he ? *Thou hast set a Hedge*
about him, I cannot come at him
(O blessed and praised forever be
the Lord, he hath set an Hedge
 Verf. 11. *about his People)* But put forth

thy Hand now, saith Satan, and
 touch all that he hath, and he will
 curse thee

curse thee to thy Face. The De-
vil, we see here, could not charge
Job that *he did sin*, but insinuates
against him, that if he were close-
ly tryed, *he would sin.* Thou
shalt see that (said God) *Behold*
that he hath is in thy Power,
only upon himself put not forth thy
Hand. Satan forthwith sets his
Agents on work, *The Sabeans*
fall upon Job's Oxen & his Asses,
and sweep them all away. *The*
Caldeans in three Bands fell upon
his Camels, and carried them all
away. *Fire from Heaven fell*
upon the Sheep, and burnt them
up; and in all these Calamities
his Servants also were slain and
destroyed, but one in a place escap-
ing to bring him the doleful Ti-
dings. Then to compleat his
Milery, in steps another, and
tells him, *His Sons and Daugh-*
ters were feasting together, and
a Wind from the Wilderness threw
the House on their Heads, and
they were everyone dead. Now
was Satan listening to hear Job

Vers. 12.

Vers. 15.

Vers. 17.

Vers. 16.

Vers. 19

Verf. 21. *curse*, but instead of *Cursing*,
 Verf. 22. Job *blessed* the Name of the
 Lord: And says the Text, *In all*
this Job SINNED NOT.

Well, the next time Satan
 presented himself before the
 Lord, God did (if I may so say)
 Chap. 2. *glory in the Perfection* of his
 Verf. 3. *Servant Job*; and again sets him
 forth a *Perfect and Upright Man*,
one that feared God, and eschewed
Evil, and still he holds fast his In-
tegrity (saith the Lord) *although*
thou movest me against him, to de-
stroy him without Cause. Satan
 had not yet got *any thing* to
 charge him with, he had not yet
 found *any flaw* in Job, yet his En-
 mity still remain'd, and he would
 not cease *suggesting Evil* of him;
 Verf. 4. therefore sayes he, *Skin for Skin*,
yea, all that a man has will he give
for his Life; but touch him to
 Verf. 5. the Quick, *touch his Bone and his*
Flesh, and he will yet Curse thee
 Verf. 6. *to thy Face.* Behold, saith the
 Lord, *he is in thy Hand, only*
spare his Life. Satan hereupon
 smote

*smote Job with sore Boils, from
the Sole of his Foot to his Crown;
and to heighten his Misery, sets
his Wife upon him too; Dost
thou yet retain thy Integrity?*

Verf. 7.]

(sayes she) Curses God, and Dye.

Verf. 2.

*This Satan longed for: But how
does Job answer? Thou speakest
as one of the foolish Women speak;
What! shall we receive Good at
the Hand of God, and shall we*

Verf. 10.

*not receive Evil? In all this (says the Text)
Job did NOT SIN with his Lips. Ob-
serve what Care the Penman of this Story
took to clear Job's innocent Life from any
Imputation of Evil.*

I have insisted the larger upon this Instance
to shew the Reader, That Job, in the prece-
dent part of his Life (before this unparalel-
led Tryal fell upon him) had indeed attained
a State of Deliverance and Freedom from
Sin; and was preserved by the Lord to as that
he SINNED NOT; Satan himself could
not accuse him, And if thus it was with
Job in the former part of his Life, what may
be thought of his latter dayes, when he had
been purged and tryed in the Furnace of Af-

affliction, and had passed through the Refiner's Fire?

Now having proved this State attainable, by shewing that *it was attained*, the Controversie is determined; for the Question was not, whether it was possible for a man, having attained this State, to *continue always* in it, but whether it is possible for him ever to attain it, grant this, and the other will follow: If it be possible to *attain it*, it cannot be impossible to *retain it*. The same divine Power that *brings man to it*, is equally able to *preserve him in it*. If it be possible for a man to be preserved in this State an *Hour*, it is not *impossible* to be preserved a *Day*; if a *Day*, a *Year*; if a *Year*, an *Age*. But when I say it is *possible to be kept* in this State; I do not say it is *impossible to depart* from it. When I say it is *possible to stand*, I do not say, it is *impossible to fall*. *Adam* was placed in a State of *Parity*, free from *Sin*; it was possible for him to have stood in that State, yet not *impossible* for him to fall from it, as sad Experience shews. Now as that one *Sin* of *Adam's* is not made use of by any to prove that he was not in a perfect sinless State, so neither ought a *single Slip*, or Failing of any of the People

of God, to be used as an Argument, that they *were never* really in a State of Purity and Freedom from Sin, of whom the holy Ghost bears witness, that they were *perfect, upright, blameless, without Fault, &c.*

His next and last Instance is of *David*, a man after God's own Heart; against him he objects, that *he fell into the heinous Sins of Adultery and Murder*, page 36.

Ans. To be a man after God's own Heart is to be just as God would have him to be; but *was David a man after God's own Heart while guilty of Adultery and Murder?* none I hope will so affirm; for Adultery and Murder are Sins, and *all Sin is utterly contrary to the Heart and Nature of God*: Now then, if *David was not a man after God's own Heart* (i. e. not such an one as God would have him to be) *while he was guilty of Sin*, I thence infer, that *when David was a man after God's own Heart* (i. e. such an one as God would have him to be) *he was not guilty of Sin but was free from it.*

Thus have I endeavoured to vindicate the *Lives* of these good and godly men, from the *false Suggestions* of their and my Adversary, wherewith he essays to *distain their Glory*, by representing them *Sinners all their*

Lives. My next Business is to vindicate also some Scriptures he hath brought, from the *wrong Construction* he hath put upon them.

The first is, *Phil. 3. 15.* *Let us therefore as many as be perfect, be thus minded.* By perfect, here he sayes is meant no more then sincere and to prove it brings ver. 12. *Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect.*

Ans. If then after his Sense we read the former verse thus, *Let us therefore as many as be SINCERE be thus minded,* we must by the same Reason read the latter thus, *Not as though I had already attained, or were already SINCERE;* which were to make the Apostle charge himself with *Hypocrisie*; but to avoid this Absurdity, he would have it read perfect in the 12th. verse, and sincere in the 15th, although the Greek Word be the same in both, and to give some Colour to it, he inserts the 11th. verse. *If by any means I might attain to the Resurrection of the dead,* then follows, *Not as though I had attained, either were already perfect;* intimating (saith the Priest)

that he could not be
The Word FULLY] * fully perfect, till
 he ought not to thrust in, he had attained the
 for it alters both the text *Resurrection of the*
 and *dead*

dead, which Resurrection this man must necessarily understand of the general Resurrection of good and bad

and the case, as relating to the degree of Perfection, not the kind, which is the Subject we are upon.

at the last Day, because he urges it as a bar to Perfection in this World: Now that this was not the Resurrection which the Apostle meant, I offer these Reasons to prove. 1st.

If he had intended that Resurrection, he needed not have used such a conditional and doubtful Expression, implying a Hazard, or Uncertainty of attaining [*If by any means I might attain unto the Resurrection of the dead*] whenas himself well knew beyond all Hæitation, or Doubting, that that Resurrection would certainly come, and that every one, both good and bad, must have a Share in that Resurrection, either to everlasting Happiness or Misery. 2^{dly}. It had been an Absurdity (not to be suspected of him) for him to have told the *Philippians*, that he had not yet attained the general Resurrection both of quick and dead, when that (according to the Priest's own Principles) was not to be expected till the *Disolution* of the World, in which he himself was yet alive, whereas a

Resurrection implies a Death foregoing; This therefore cannot be the Resurrection by Paul here intended, but there is another Resurrection mentioned in Scripture, by the Name of the *first* Resurrection (*Blessed and holy is he that hath Part in the first Resurrection, on such the second Death hath no Power, &c.* Rev. 20. 6.) This the Apostle refers to in his Epistle to the Colossians, *If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, &c.*

The Priest being thus out in his Notion of the Resurrection, his interpretation of the Text (which he grounded upon this Notion) is not to be admitted; for he hath not offered any substantial Reason, why *τέλειον* in the 15th verse should be read *sincere*, and and yet *τέλειον* in the 12th verse should be read *perfect*, especially considering that *τέλειον* is rarely (if ever) rendred in Scripture by *sincere*, nor do I think he will readily find throughout the whole New Testament any one place where it is so rendred, but for *perfect* it is generally used.

The next Scripture he undertaks to open, is 1 John 5. 18. *We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not* (thus far only he goes omitting the rest of the verse, which is thus,

But

But he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that Wicked one toucheth him not. This he saith, cannot signifie that any in this Life hath got an absolute Conquest over all Sin, and that for two Reasons. 1st. Because St. John here would contradict other plain Texts, as 1 Kings 8. 46. 2 Chron. 6. 36. Eccles. 7. 20. which places say, there is no man that sinneth not.

Ans^w. The Words of the Apostle are not contradictory to these, the one speaks of man in a natural State, the other of man as begot & born of God; neither doth that Phrase [there is no man that sinneth not] import, that there is no man but sinneth all his Life long; but it imports that there is no man but sinneth at one time or other of his Life, which suites well with the Apostle's Words, *All have sinned, and come short of the Rom. 3. 23. Glory of God,* but this man who hath sinned coming now to be born of God, to be a new Creature, to have Christ formed in him, he now by the Power which he receives from Christ, keeps himself, and that Wicked one toucheth him not. *Ye are kept by the Power of God, through Faith unto Salvation, &c. 1 Pet. 1. 5.*

The next Scripture is, *Prov. 20. 9. Who can*

can say I have made my Heart clean, I am pure from my Sin?

Ans. No man can say in Truth, *he himself* hath made his own Heart clean; but he whose Heart God hath cleansed, can say, and that in Truth, *God hath made his Heart clean.* The latter Part of this verse depends upon the former: No man can say, I am pure from my Sin, by having *my self* cleansed my own Heart; but he whose *Heart is purified*, whose *Iniquity is taken away*, and his *sin purged* by the Lord, he can say, in an humble acknowledgement, and to the Glory of him who purged him, *The Lord hath purged me from my sin.*

Another Scripture that he brings is, *Ezek. 18.24.* which hath not the least Tendency to prove that man cannot be set free from sin in this Life, but that, *if the Righteous man turnes from his Righteousness, and committeth Iniquity again* (which implies there was a time when he did not commit Iniquity) that then *his former Righteousness shall not avail him, but in his sin he shall dye, &c.*

Another is *Job 9. 20.* *If I justify my self, my own Mouth shall condemn me; if I say I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse.*

Ans. Self-Justification, and whatsoever
is

is grounded thereupon, is indeed condemnable; but the Justification which comes from God is not so: *Who shall lay any thing to the Charge of God's Elect? It is God that justifies, who is he that condemns?* Job doth not here deny Perfection, but sheweth, that however it was with him, or how high soever his Attainments were, he would not take upon him to contend with his Maker, or justify himself against the Almighty, but submit himself unto him, and therefore he saith in the 15th verse, *Whom, though I were Righteous yet would I not answer, but I would make supplication to my Judge, yet to shew that he did not this from any Guilt of sin that lay upon him, he appeals to God himself Thou knowest (saith he) that I am not Wicked, & yet for all that, there is none can deliver me out of thy Hand; but though he thus expresseth himself in Submission to the Hand and good Pleasure of the Lord (whose Power and Sovereignty he acknowledgeth) yet against the false Suggestions of his seeming Friends (who, like this Priest, would fain have fastned some Iniquity upon him) he vindicates his Innocency plainly and smartly. Till I.* chap. 27. 5, 6.

eye (saith he) I will not remove my Integrity from me, my Righteousness I hold fast and will not let it go; my Heart shall not reproach me so long as I live: And it is observable, that those three men who [like this Priest] had charged Sin upon Job, were faine to offer Sacrifice, and intreat Job's Prayers on their behalf, to appease the Wrath of the Lord, which they had kindled against themselves. chap 42. 7, 8, 9.

He urges also *Gal. 3. 22.* But that being the same with *Rom. 3. 23.* is explained before.

Another that he brings is, *James 3. 2. In many things we offend all.*

Answ. This does not prove that the Apostle himself was an Offender, any more then that other saying of his concerning the Tongue, *vers. 9. Therewith Bless we God, and therewith Curse we Men,* can prove that the Apostle himself was a Curser, which I do not helieve this Priest, as forward as he is toully the Saints will dare to affirm of the Apostle *James.*

These are the Scriptures he hath quoted, to prove that *St Iohn* (in those words, *Who-soever is born of God sinneth not*) did not intend, that any in this Life hath gotten an absolute Conquest over all Sin. But, in the respective Answer thereunto, I have shewed, that the Apostle may very well be under-

stood

stood in this without the least Contradiction to any of these Scriptures, none of which plead for a Continuation of Sin, or deny a Possibility of being perfectly freed from Sin.

His 2d Reason, why those words of *John* cannot be interpreted to signifie, that any in this Life hath gotten an absolute Conquest over all Sin is, *because he would then contradict himself also, having plainly said, 1 John 1. 8. If we say we have no Sin, we deceive our selves, and the Truth is not in us, pag. 39.*

Answ. From the last Instance in the words of *James*, it is evident that the Apostles, in Condescension to those to whom they writ, did many times include themselves as in the Condition of others, that so they to whom they writ, might receive Exhortation the better. And thus did *John* in this place, He, as well as *Paul*, writ of the several States and Conditions, Growths and Degrees in the Church of God, in which no doubt there were some, who could not at that time truly say, *they had no sin*. To these he condescends, with these he includes himself. And as *Paul* in one place said, *I speak after the manner of men, because of the Infirmitie of your Flesh*, Rom. 6. 19, And in another place, *To the Weak became I as weak, that*

I might gain the Weak, 1 Cor. 9. 22. the same may be said in this place of John, who, for their sakes, including himself with them, did, in his own Person joyntly with theirs, speak of that State which some of them were then in, and which himself also had once been in, as well as they. But from this Condescension of his, to infer, that he himself was at that time, really and actually in that State, is neither fair nor true, for though some among them might not have attained so far, yet he himself had doubtless felt the

Blood of Jesus Christ cleansing him from all sin, else could he not experimentally have said, *If we confess our Sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness.*

But if he did really and truly know, that the Blood of Jesus Christ had cleansed him from all Sin, from all Unrighteousness: Surely then he might at that time, without deceiving himself, have said he had no sin.

He writes to Little Children, to Young Men, to Fathers; He tells the little Children, *their*

Sins

Sins were forgiven; yea, and that they knew the Truth, which our Saviour told the Jews should make them free. But he tells the Young Men, they are strong, and the Word of God abideth in them, and they have overcome the Wicked one (Is not that a Conquest over Sin?) He exhorts the Little Children, to abide in Christ; for whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not; and we are in him, saith the Apostle himself; and he that abideth in him, ought also to walk even as he walked. Doth he tell them, they ought to do that which is impossible? or had not Christ an absolute Conquest over all Sin? We know (saith the Apostle) that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keeps himself that the Wicked One toucheth him not. If he be so kept, that the Wicked One (which is the Devil) touches him not, how can he sin? Doth any sin but whom the Devil touches? So long as any are kept out of the Devil's Reach, so long I hope he'll grant they may be with-

John 8,
32.

1 John 2,
14.

Vers. 28.

Chap. 3,
6.

Chap. 2,
6.

Chap. 5,
18.

out Sin, These Young Men then, who had so overcome the Wicked One (the Devil) that he could not touch them, had not these gotten an absolute Conquest over all sin? Now if such was the state of the Young Men, what had the Fathers and Elders arrived to! *These things* (sayes John) *I write unto you, my Little Children* (not to countenance your continuance in sin, not to beget a Belief in you, that it is impossible for you to live without Sin; To what End then?) *that ye sin not.*

Chap. 2. *And if any man sin, we have an Advocate, &c. If any man sin! why, is it come to that?*

(might such a man as this have then objected) Dost thou make an *if* of that, which is so certain, so unquestionable, so unavoidable! *If any man sin!* as if it were possible for any man to live and not sin! Yes, yes, (saith this holy Apostle) if he abide in Christ; *for he that abideth in Christ, sinneth not.*

Chap. 3. *And in this he is not contradictory to himself; for indeed, the whole stream of his Epistle runs in this Channel.*

But it seems strange to the Priest, that our Lord should teach his Disciples to pray as often for the Forgiveness of their sins, as for their

their daily Bread, whilst we must suppose (says he) that when they so prayed, they had no Trespasses to forgive, pag. 39.

Ans. This will not seem so strange, if it be considered, that when our Lord taught his Disciples thus to pray, they were but young and weak; their Faith, which should have given them Victory over Sin, was weak, and sometimes almost ready to waver; and therefore in the very same Chapter, he blames the Little-ness of their Faith, and frequently after, in the same Book of *Matthew* calls them, O ye of Little Faith. They had not yet experienced the Work of Faith with Power, in that Degree which afterwards they did; for the Holy Ghost was not yet poured forth, because that Jesus was not yet glorified. Now this Form of Prayer was suited to their present Condition; but it doth not appear that it was intended to be a standing Rule for them to pray by, as long as they lived, but as a Supple-

1 John 5.
4.

2 Thess. 1.
11.

John 7.
39.

John 15.
26.

Chap. 16.
13.

Rom. 8.
26.

ment to their Weakness, until the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, was come unto them, which Christ promised to send them immediately after his Departure, and (as it were) in his room. But when the Comforter was come, when they had received the Spirit of Truth in that more eminent Degree; He was then to *lead them into all Truth*; He was to *teach them what they should pray for* (and that after an higher manner then hitherto they had prayed, as our Saviour's words imply, *John* 16. 2 . .) and he did so, as the Apostle witnesseth. *Likewise the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities*; for we know not what we should ask for as we ought (mark that, for all their former Teaching) *but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with Groans, which cannot be uttered.*

From Scripture-Arguments he comes to Reason; *Who*, sayes he, *can be so confident to say, He is free from all the Infirmities of his Nature?*
Answer.

Ans. Every Infirmary of Nature is not Sin : A man therefore may be free from Sin, though not from all the Infirmities of his Nature.

Again, *He that saith he cannot fall by Error, is already fallen by Pride.*

Ans. This relates not to a Possibility of not sinning, but to an Impossibility of sinning ; which is not the Subject of the present Controversie.

He goes on to shew, That it is not they that give Incouragement to sin, by denying a Possibility of being freed from it ; but we, who believe such a Possibility. *Pray, says he, who is your Friend, he that saith you have no Enemy, or he that informs you where he lurks?* pag. 41.

Ans. He all along mistakes the Case, either through Ignorance or Design : yet I would not think the worst of him. By Perfection, by a State of Freedom from Sin, we do not mean a State free from being tempted to sin. Our blessed Saviour (in whom was no sin) in that sense was not free ; *he was tempted by the Devil* *Mat. 4. 1.* But to be tempted is no sin. So that we do not tell People, they have no Enemy ;

- but we tell them, they have an Enemy; we tell them where this Enemy lurks, and how he works.
- 1 John 2. 13. We tell them, this Enemy may be overcome, and also how. Now then, turn the Question the right Way, and let me ask, *Who is thy Friend, O Man, He that tells thee, Thou canst never overcome, thy Enemy will be too hard for thee, 'tis in vain to expect a Compleat Victory? or He that encourages thee to fight the good Fight of Faith; and tells thee, that Satan, if thou resist him, will flee before thee; and not only so, but that the God of Peace will tread Satan under thy Feet, and that shortly too?*
- 1 Tim. 6. 12. James 4. 7. Rom. 16. 20.

Again, He says, *It is one Step to Conversion, to see our selves unconverted; and one Step more to Happiness, to perceive our selves Miserable Sinners.*

Ans. I grant indeed it is so. But must we alwayes stand upon this one Step? Must we never take another Step? Never step forward? He moves very slow indeed, that takes but one step all his Life. If we see our selves

elves miserable sinners at the first step must we see our selves miserable sinners at the last step too (which they do, from the first step to the last confess themselves such, or else they sin in so confessing) this is *miserable* indeed ! *miserable Comforters* are all they, who tell men, they must be *miserable Sinners* as long as they live : Let such take heed that they run not in vain.

Again, He saith, *I need not guard my House, when I am sure that no Thieves can enter.*

Ans. This is also quite besides the business: The Question is not, whether no Thieves can enter, although I do not guard my house but whether it is possible for me to keep the Thieves from entering, if I do guard my house? That this is possible our Saviour expressly tells us, *If (saith he) the good man of the House had known at what Hour the Thief would come, he would have watcht, and not have suffered his House to be* Luke 12. 39. *broken through :* So that the good man had *Power*, and was able to have kept out the Thief, if he had stood upon his Guard ; and the intent of this Parable was to excite the Disciples to Watchfulness, which our Saviour did frequently inculcate to them

What I say unto you I say unto
 Mark 13. 27. *all watch.* And again, *Watch*
 Mat. 26. 41. *and pray that ye enter not into*
Temptation; for there's the Sin.

It is not a Sin to be tempted, but it is a Sin to enter into the Temptation: Now then, if the Disciple watches and prays, it is possible for him to be kept from *entering into* Temptation, and consequently possible for him to be kept from *sinning*, which is directly to the Case.

Again, he saith, *it is in vain to offer him Physick, who concludes himself well.*

Ans. If any man that is not well concludes himself well, he is to blame; but that is nothing to our purpose: The Question is *Whether he that doth really receive the Physick, and doth carefully observe the prescriptions of the Physician, can be perfectly cured or no?* The Disease is Sin, can man be perfectly cured of this Disease? If he grants he may, he yields the Cause; if he denies it, he shifts upon the Ability of the Physician.

Mark 5. 25. *can.* The poor Woman with the bloody issue, had suffered much from many Physicians, and spent all she had upon them, but was never a whit

(87)
whit the better (*Miserable Sinners as she
first, and miserable Sinners to
the last*) her bloody Issue ran John 7. 23.
twelve Years together, but
when once she came to Christ, he made her
whole: *He works perfect Cures.*

Will the Priest say, that man may and shall
be cured of his Disease of sinning, but *not in
this Life*, not till he dies; this is not Gospel
surely; for that is *Glad-tidings*, but this is
Sad-tidings to the poor patient, that he must
carry his Disease with him to his Grave, and
yet alwayes be taking costly Physick, this (if
he believe it) were enough, one would think
to send him forthwith thither: If such a cure
could have satisfied the poor Woman, she
might have saved both her Pains and Money;
for she could not doubt but that she should
be rid of her Disease when she died; but that
would not serve her turn, 'twas a *Pain and a
Barden* to her while she lived, and therefore
she sought up and down, far and near for a
Physician that could cure her of it in her Life
time, and at length to her unpeakable Joy
she found him; *They therefore that say, the
Disease of Sin can never be perfectly cured in
this Life, are all Physicians for Value.*

Again he saith, *But if on the contrary han*

I find my self weak, then I lay hold on him that is strong, from a Sense of my Infirmities I seek after Help; if I find many Enemies, I prepare against them; if I be thoroughly convinc'd that I am beset round with Temptations and such Stratagems as are under the Conduct of such a powerful and politick Enemy, as the Devil is without me; and to compleat my Misery, that I have a false and treacherous Heart within me, being in those sad Circumstances, I see the Necessity of a Saviour, set my Watch, and flee from the Confidence of Flesh, to the Protection of an Almighty Arm.

Ans. Well, here's a fair Preparation to the Battle, but what is the issue? He seeks (he saith) after Help, he layes hold on him that's strong, he prepares against his Enemy, he flees from the Confidence of Flesh, to the Protection of an Almighty Arm; but what is the Event of the Fight? Is he indeed protected? Is he kept that the wicked one touch him not? Doth he overcome his Enemy? Doth he put 1 John 5. 18. him to flight? Is he preserved out of the Temptation, and consequently out of Sin? Surely then he would never plead against the Possibility of overcoming; but on the other Hand, doth the Enemy overcome him

him? doth he prevail *against him*? doth he fall before the Enemy? Doth he *enter into* the Temptation, and *commit the Sin* he is tempted to? O then let him never boast of this, or propose it for an Encouragement to others; for what can be a greater Discouragement to young Souldiers, then for one that is reputed an old experienced Souldier to tell them, I have fought against this Enemy with all the Strength and Courage that man can have, and have used all the Wayes and Means that are possible to be used, and yet he hath been *too hard* for me? Who would not blame and despise that General, that having brought his Forces into the Field, should upon the Brink of engaging tell his Souldiers, that he knew before hand, *they should not have the Victory*? But we are not discouraged by the false Reports of *Evil Spi's* who have often told us of the Children of *Anack*, of their Strength, and of their Walled Cities, and of our *inability* to Numb. 13. overcome them; but *Caleb* and *Joshua* (men of a *right spirit*) believe and report otherwise.

I observe that among the many sad Circumstances, that just now he reckoned up, as motives to betake himself to his Defence against

against the Assaults of his Enemy, one was his Heart: And saith he, *To compleat my Misery, that I have a false and treacherous Heart within Me,* page 42.

Ans. We have hitherto been speaking of a regenerate State, a sanctified State, of man's best state in this World, not his worst, but a false and treacherous Heart belongs to his worst State, not his best: The Lord by

his Prophet hath promised to
 Ez. 36. 26. give his People a New Heart;

Now if the old Heart was false and treacherous, is this
 Mat. 5. 8. new Heart which God gives false and Treacherous also?
 Christ pronounce them

Luke 8. 15. blessed that are pure in Heart, but is that Heart

false and treacherous? That Seed which brings forth Fruit is sown in the best and good Heart, not in the false and treacherous Heart.

No wonder that this man is against perfection, if he be troubled with a false and a treacherous Heart; but he is out as much in allowing sincerity in men, while he admits their Hearts to be false and treacherous; for it is impossible for any man whose Heart is false to be sincere; for to be sincere, is to be true-

H. and

Hearted: Thus in his Eagerness to run down Perfection, he hath run himself into this Absurdity, *That regenerate and sanctified men have false and treacherous Hearts*, but to go on.

The Parishioner offers him two Scriptures (*Ephes. 5. 5. and Rev. 21. 27.*) from which he saith, we may learn, that no Unclean thing can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, which implies a Necessity of an Unsinning State, even in this Life, and that in order to our Happiness in the next. To this he replies

I shall not need to spend much page 42.
time in Refutation of your mistake
in these Scriptures; do but duly consult them,
and the best Commentators on them, and you will
find they import no more, than that no Unre-
generate and Unsanctified Person shall have
any Share in Bliss or Happiness.

Ans. This is his whole Reply, and in this methinks he treads so light, as if he were willing to give us the slip; however his Parishioner is satisfied with it, for my Part I am not, and therefore he must not take it amiss if I press him a little further.

If in this Life. Freedom from Sin be not attainable, *when, and where* is it? As Death leaves Judgement finds; for *in the Grave*
there

there is no Remembrance ; and nothing that is Unclean can enter Heave Where then is the place of purging? Will he seek out a middle Region? He had best take heed lest he drop into Purgatory; the Papists indeed have dreamt of such a Place; but I am now treating with one who professeth himself a Protestant: The Christians of old had no such Devices nor had they need of any, for they had received the Faith that gave them Victory, by which they over-

John 5. 4. came the World, and kept
James 1. 27. themselves unspotted from it
John 5. 18. that the Evil one could not
Col. 1. 27. touch them; they were pos-
Ephes. 6. 11. sessed of the purifying Hope,
vs 17. which was Christ in them;

they had put on the whole Armour of Light, by the only Shield whereof, they were able to quench all the fiery Darts of the Devil; Righteousness was their Breast-plate; their Helmet Salvation, and their Hearts were neither false nor treacherous: Thus was it with the Saints of old. Let now the Priest, who denies a perfect Cleansing in this Life, shew when and where that Cleansing is to be expected. Our Saviour Christ told the Jews, If they would not believe, they

they should dye in their Sins,
 and if they dy. d in their Sins, John 8. 21, 24.
 whether he went they should
 never come. A sad Sentence I wist, to them
 that believe they shall never be free from Sin
 while they live.

But saith the Parishioner, By denying Per-
 fection, a Fundamental in Divinity is over-
 thrown (viz.) That the second Adam has gain-
 ed what the first lost. To this the Priest thus
 replies, You cannot think that the first Adam
 had a State of such Perfection, as to make it
 impossible for him to sin; for you know he did ac-
 tually sin; such a Perfection he never lost, nor
 did Christ gain such a State for us in this
 World.

Ans. 'Tis strange a man should so often
 beat the Air, and fight with his own Shadow;
 here again he wrests the Case from a Possibi-
 lity of not sinning, to an Impossibility of sin-
 ning, But if Christ did gain such a State for us
 in this World as Adam lost (in respect of
 Righteousness and Innocency) then to be sure
 Christ hath (at least) gained such a State for
 us in this World, as renders it possible for a
 man to live without Sin; for such a State
 Adam lost. Hear what the Priest at length
 grants, We are indeed (saith he) by Christ
 and

and the Grace of God put into such a State, as that we may please God, considering what he now expects and accepts through Christ; as well as Adam could, considering what God required then, page 43. Very good, he required Faith and Obedience then of Adam; he requireth Faith and Obedience now of us: He gave Adam Power to believe and obey; he gives Power now to believe & obey; for he is not an hard Master, whatever some think of him, he requires no more then he gives Power to perform and yet he requires to be served without Sin.

Nor is it at all repugnant to Reason, that the strongest should prevail; our Saviour plainly affirms it, in his Parable of the strong man keeping his House, till a

Luke 11.21. stronger then he come, and overcome him: Now is not Christ stronger then the Devil?

2 2. Hear what the apostle saith, Greater is he that is in you,

then he that is in the World: Why then should it seem so impossible a thing to any, that the Devil (& Sin which is of him) should be overcome in this Life? Christ was the Author of that Faith which overcomes the World; but who was the Author of that Faith which holds it impossible to overcome? Be of good.

Chear

Cheer, saith Christ, I (who am your Captain, your Example, 1 John 16. 33. whom you are to follow, and imitate, I) have overcome the World, there by letting you see, that the world may be overcome: What then is the Reason that it is not? Will any lay the Blame upon God? God forbid; but many will say man is weak, and full of Frailty, and compassed about with Infirmities. Man indeed is very weak, but God is pleased to display his Strength through man's Weakness; Sa an indeed is v ry strong, but God is stronger then he, and binds the strong man, and dispossess him with all his Goods: The Buffetings of the Enemy are oft times thick and hard, yet still the Grace is sufficient: Paul of himself could do no hing, yet was able to do all things through Christ, who worke b in his both to will and to do of his own good Pleasure. Thou hast wrought all our Works in us, said the Evongellical

1 Cor. 12. 9,

Mark 3. 27.

2 Cor. 12. 7. 9,

Phil. 2. 13.

Isaiah 26. 12.

Prophet

- Prophet (*Was there any*
Sin in these Works?) Why
 had Christ the Name Jesus
 given him, but because he
 was to save his People from
 their Sin? and was he to
 save them from some Sins
 only and not from all?
 John said of him, *He will*
thoroughly purge his Floor,
 and must we now think he
 will purge it but in Part?
 The Author to the He-
 brews saith, *He is able to*
save them to the uttermost,
that come unto God by him: All outward Dis-
 eases he cured perfectly, and shall the Ma-
 ladies of the Soul be cured but by halves? The
 Apostle Paul tells the Romans,
That the old man is crucified
with Christ, that the Reign of
Sin might be destroyed; and
that he that is dead is free from
Sin: Nay, *How shall we* (saith
 he) *that are dead to Sin live*
any longer therein? And again,
Being made free from Sin, ye
became the Servants of Righte-
ousness,

eousness. What mean the Scriptures in so many places to hold forth a State of Freedom from Sin in this Life, if no such thing is to be here expected; *They that are Christ's have crucified the Flesh, with the Affections and Lusts, saith Paul. He that hath suffered in the Flesh hath ceased from Sin, saith Peter. There is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, (saith Paul) who walk not after the Flesh but after the Spirit.* If there be no Condemnation to them, there is no sin committed by them: for, wheresoever there is Sin, there is also Condemnation: for, *The Lord will not justify the Wicked.* If we walk in the Light, as he is in the Light, then have we Fellowship one with another, and the Blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all Sin, saith the Apostle John. So Paul to the Corinthians, *Having therefore these Promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all Filthiness of the Flesh and Spirit, perfecting holiness in the Fear of the Lord.*

H

Galat. 5.

24.

1 Pet. 4.

Rom. 8.

1.

Ex. 28. 7.

1 John 1.

7.

2 Cor. 7.

1.

And

And with what Zeal doth the
 2 Th^{ss}. same Apostle pray for the Thes-
 5. 23. salonians, *The very God of Peace
 sanctifie you wholly; and I pray
 God, your whole Spirit, and Soul, and Body may
 be preserved blameless unto the coming of our
 Lord J. Jas. Christ.* With what fervor of
 Spirit did that Good Man pray for that,
 which, had he lived in this untoward Age,
 he might happily have been blamed for ex-
 pecting!

But consider; Can it be indeed *profitable*
 for any man to *live in sin*, or *injurious* to him-
 self to be freed from it? Nay, is not *sin*, on the
 contrary, the greatest *Hurt and Injury* that
 ever did or can befall Mankind? Why then
 is this man so angry with us, for *believing it*
possible to be preserved from Sin, and in that
 Faith *desiring to be preserved* from it, and en-
 deavouring to live without it? Does not
 himself say, (pag. 34.) *It is good to set the*
Mark as high as may be, so that we may be
excited to endeavour nobly? And will he not-
 withstanding blame us, for not setting the
 Mark too low? How unfairly are we dealt
 with?

Thus far in Defence of this truly Gospel
 Doctrine, of being perfectly delivered and
 pre-

preserved from Sin. Now to all you Priests and others, who set your selves in Opposition thereunto, this in short I have to say; Repent, Repent, and cease to pervert the Right Way of the Lord, lest in the Day when he maketh Inquisition for Blood, ye be found guilty of destroying the Souls of many.

For verily, as the Evil Spies discouraged the Heart of the Children of *Israel*, that they should not go into the Land which the Lord had given them; by telling them, they were not able to overcome their Enemies, but that

Numbers
32. 9.

Chap. 13.
31.

the People of the Land were stronger then they: Even so do ye discourage the People at this day, from pressing after a pure and sinless State, by telling them it is not possible to attain thereto in this Life: Yet lowering Pillows under their Armholes, and daubing them up with untempered Morter, ye perswade them it shall go well with them although they sin against the Lord. Thus ye strengthen the Hands of the Wicked, that he returneth not from his Wicked Way, by promising him Life. And thus like the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* of old (against whom our

Lord denounced so many and
 Mar. 23. such dreadful woes: Ye shut up
the Kingdom of Heaven against
men, neither entering in yourselves, nor suf-
fering others to enter.

CHAP. VI. Of Swearing.

FROM the Doctrine of Perfection the
 Priest passes on to that of Swearing; at
 his very entrance into which, he makes a Di-
 gression, to deliver himself of a Notion
 (wherewith it seems his Head was pregnant)
 concerning the two Covenants, namely, of
 Works and of Grace. *The Covenant of Works,*
 he says, *was made with Adam before he fell.*
Th's, he says, is called by Divines a Cove-
nant of Works, because an exact Obedience
was required of him, and a Reward promised
him upon that Obedience, pag 48. And this
Covenant, he says, none lived under but Adam
only, pag. 50.

Ans. Of this he offers no Proof at all,
 which he had great Reason to have done, if
 he

he had any to offer, considering that he treadeth an unbeaten Path. Where doth the Scripture say, that *Adam* was under a Covenant of Works? or what were the Works he was under? *Adam* indeed was commanded not to eat of the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge: Will he say that was a Covenant? If of every Command he will make a Covenant, he may find more Covenants then Chapters in the Bible. And upon the same Reason, he may call this a Covenant of Works too, under which Believers now live, because many things are commanded and forbidden therein.

But if *Adam* had fallen from a Covenant of Works to a Covenant of Grace, what had his *Loss* been? what had he suffered? He had not then fallen from *better to worse* (which he did) but from *worse to better*: for the Covenant of Grace is *better* then the Covenant of Works was or could be, as the Apostle argue-, *Hebr. 8. 6.*

But as this Man would make *Adam*, in his state of Innocency, to be under a Covenant of Works, *without any Scripture-Proof*: so he would make the Covenant of the *Jews* (or the Covenant of the Law, under which the *Jews* were) to be not a Covenant of

Works, quite contrary to the Scripture, That that Covenant that Moses and David lived under, was a Covenant of Works, I utterly deny, sayes he. Whereas the Scripture, speaking of the Law, and the Works thereof (which was the Covenant under which Moses and David lived) sayes expressly, *Ye shall keep my Statutes*

Lev. 18. 5. and my Judgments, which if a man do, he shall live in them: Was not this a Covenant of Works? Was not here an Obedience re-

Galat. 3. 10. quired (yea, an exact Obedience too; for, Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law, to do them) and Life promised as a Reward upon that Obedience? The same said the

Ezek. 20. 21. Lord by his Prophet, complaining of Rebellious Israel; They walked not in my Statutes, neither kept my Judgments, to do them, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. To the same purpose also speaketh the Apostle

Rom. 10. 5. Gal. 3. 12. Paul. And will this man notwithstanding adventure to say, that

that this was not a Covenant of Works? When *Moses* had told the People all the Words of the Lord, and all the Judgments, then all the People answer'd with one Voice, and said, *All the Words which the Lord hath said we will do* (the same is repeated, *Deut. 5. 27.*) Here are Works commanded to be done: Here's an undertaking on the Peoples's Part, who promise to do them. Reward also is propos'd upon Obedience: Punishment upon Disobedience. If this be not a Covenant of Works, what is? *Divines*, he sayes, do therefore call that a Covenant of Works, which was made with Adam in his Innocent State, because an exact Obedience was required, and a Reward thereupon promised. But if an exact Obedience was required in this Covenant under which *Moses* and *David* were, and a Reward thereupon promised (as is most clear from *Deut. 5. 32, 33.*) How can he, without contradicting himself and his *Divines*, deny this to be a Covenant of Works? Let the Reader judge.

Again, He would make that Covenant under which they lived, and the Covenant under which we now live (the Covenant of the Law

and the Covenant of the Gospel) *to be one and the same.* Whereas the

Jer. 31.
31, 32.

Lord not only calleth it *the latter a New Covenant*, but also saith, *It is not according to that which he made with Israel of old.* Which

Hebr. 8.

Words, the Author to the Hebrews referring to, argues this *Latter Covenant* to be not only *not the same with the former*, but to be a *better Covenant*, and established al'o upon *better Promises* then the former. And in his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle (who knew how to deliver himself, as well it may be as this Priest does) calls them expressly *Two Covenants* (not 2 Forms, or Modes only of Administration, of one and the same Covenant, as the Priest does) and plainly shews by the Allegory of Abraham's two Sons, that they were *distinct and different Covenants.* For (sayes he.) it

Galat. 4.
Vers. 22.

is written, that Abraham had two Sons the one by a Bond maid, the other

other by a Free-woman: But he who
was of the Bond woman was born Vers. 23.

after the Flesh; but he of the Free-
woman was by Promise: Which
things (sayes he) are an All- Vers. 24.
gory; for these are Two Cove-

nants, &c. the one gendring to Bondage, the
other free. So that the Priest might as well
have said, that Abraham's two Sons (*Ish-*
mael and *Isaac*) were not two distinct men,
but one and the same man, differing only in
Name, Time or Habit; or that the two Moun-
tains, *Sinai* and *Sion*, are not indeed distinct
and several Mountains; but one and the same
Mountain, differenced only by divers Names;
as that these Two Covenants, of which those
things were the Allegory, are not really two
distinct Covenants, but one and the same,
differing only in the Forms or Modes of Ad-
ministration, and various Dispensations of it.

But not to insist over long on that which
himself makes but a Digression from his
Theam, I return with him to the Case of
Swearing.

He takes an Offence at *R. Hubberthorn*,
for setting in the Title-page of a Book, which
he writ against Swearing, these Scriptures,
Because of Oaths the Land mourns, *Hos. 4.*

And

And (as said the Prophet) Every one that sweareth shall be cut off Zach. 5. 3. These he saith are his Proofs (though R. H. doth not call them so himself) and hereupon he falls foul not only upon R. H. but all the Quakers also, calling this the horrible Abuse the Quakers put upon the Scriptures, and the Spirit of God by which they were writ, and that it discovers a most dishonest Principle in the Quakers, &c. page 53. 55. What's the Ground of this great Clamour? Why saith he, they confess Oaths were lawful in the time of the Law, yet do bring in Hosea and Zachary, who lived in the time of the Law, speaking against the Usage which they confess was then lawful.

Answ. He mistakes the Case, they are not brought in speaking against that which was then lawful, but against that which was then unlawful, namely the wrong Use and Abuse of Oaths: who that hath at all conversed with Books, is ignorant, that it is usual at the Foot of a Title page, to insert some Sentences (out of Holy Scripture, if the Subject of the Book be Religion; out of prophane Authors if the Discourse be of another Nature) somewhat relating or) alluding to the matter treated of. The Subject R. H. was treating of was this, that all manner of swearing

ing being forbidden by Christ, all Oaths are now unlawful, and therefore the Use of any Oaths must needs provoke the Displeasure of God against that Nation where they are used. This being the Subject of his Book, he did very artly allude to those Words of the Prophet *Hosea*, *Because of Oaths the Land mourns*. The Land mourned then because of Oaths; Why? because *those Oaths then were Unlawful*. The Land mourns now because of Oaths; why? because *all Oaths are now unlawful*. The like is to be said of the Words of *Zachary*; and this is further to be noted, that in R. H.'s Book it is thus, *And (as saith the Prophet) Every one that sweareth shall be cut off*, but this Parenthesis (as saith the Prophet) the Priest leaves out, which was not fairly done of him; for it shews the Intention of R. H. to be only to allude to the words of the Prophet, as if he had said, as the Prophet saith in another Case, so say I in this; he said, every one that swears falsely shall be cut off, because it was *unlawful to swear falsely then*: I say every one that swears at all shall be cut off because it is *unlawful to swear at all now*; it was therefore *ignorantly* at least, if not *maliciously* done of the Priest to insinuate that R. H. brought

brought these Scriptures to prove that all Oaths were as unlawful then as now; for himself confesseth that R. H. doth yield that some Oaths were lawful then.

Besides, what Reason had he to say of those Scriptures, *These are his Proofs*? what doth he mean they were Proofs of? He himself in his own Book hath set at the Foot of his Title-page this Scripture, 2 Thes. 2. 11. *For this cause God shall send them strong Delusion, that they should believe a Lye.* Did he intend this for a Proof? of what I would know? Is it to prove his Book a Conference between a Minister and a Parishioner of his? Is it to prove his Parishioner was inclining to *Quakerism*? Is it to prove that the absurd Opinions of that Sect are detected, and exposed to a just Censure? (This is the sume of his Title) or is it to prove, that *they who credit what he hath herein written against the Principles of the People called Quakers, are indeed under strong Delusion, and do believe a Lye*? But letting his pass, let us now hear what the Priest an say in defence of Swearing.

That our Saviour Christ, when he said, wear not at all &c. *Mat 5.* did not forbid ll manner of Oaths, he takes upon him to prove

prove, and saith he will do it in this order

First, By proving an Oath an Act of natural Religion towards God.

Secondly, An Act of necessary Justice, and Charity towards men.

Thirdly, That it is therefore a Part of that Moral and Eternal Law, which our Saviour professeth he came not to destroy, but to fulfil.

Fourthly, That we find it practised in the new Testament, page 5. 6.

His first Proposition (viz.) That an Oath is an Act of natural Religion towards God, I deny.

He offers to prove it by Reason, and Consent of Nations.

By Reason thus, That whereby we glorifie God, and adore his Attributes, is an Act of Religion; but by an Oath (rightly taken) we glorifie God, and adore his Attributes, therefore such an Oath is an Act of Religion.

Ans^r. The first Part of this Argument doth not reach the Proposition, he undertook to prove, namely, That an Oath is an Act of natural Religion; for in his Argument he drops the Word [Natural] and makes no mention of it, neither doth he in the Conclusion of his Argument infer that an Oath is an Act of Natural Religion, but barely thus

Th^{us}

Therefore such an Oath is an Act of Religion. Now a thing may be an Act of Religion, and

yet not an Act of *Natural* Religion (as he calls it).

The Word *natural* hath divers Acceptations; for there is the pure uncorrupted Nature, wherein man was at first made: There is the corrupt & degenerate Nature of man in the fall, in which Sense natural is in Scripture opposed to spiritual, as where the Apostle saith, The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, 1 Cor. 2. 14. And there

that is, it may be an Act of Religion by Precept or Institution, yet not an Act of Religion barely of it self, or simply from the Nature of the thing: that may be an Act of Religion, being commanded, which was not an Act of Religion before it was commanded, nor will be an Act of Religion after that Command which made it so, is repealed. Thus was it in the Case of Circumcision; it was an Act of Religion, yet not an Act of *Natural* Religion. It was no Act of Religion before it was commanded; It was an Act of Religion, after it was commanded; it is no Act of Religion since that Command which made it so is repealed. Here then

he

he hath missed his Aim, and that abundantly short of the Mark : And it is a very material Consideration for his main Drift, in asserting an Oath to be an Act of Natural Religion, seems

is the divine Nature, : of which the Saints are made Partakers, as Peter witnesseth, 2 Pet. 1.4.

to be, that he might wholly free it from Dependence upon Precept, and establish it as a Part of the Moral and Eternal Law, which in his third Proposition, he ushers in with a *Therefore*, that it being an Act of Natural Religion, &c. *It is therefore a Part of the Moral, and Eternal Law, &c.* But his *Therefore* being built upon a false Foundation, must needs therefore fall to the Ground.

And as in the first Part of his Argument there is a *Defect*, so in the second there is a *Redundancy*, which makes it stark naught ; for therein he Assumes thus *But by an Oath (rightly taken) we glorifie God, &c.* The Fallacy lies in those Words [*rightly taken*] b which he would take for granted, that an Oath may be rightly taken ; this is *nicer begging of the Question* ; for that is the main thing in Controversie : If we could grant that an Oath may be rightly taken, we should not refuse to take it our selves ; but we say no
Oath

Oath can be rightly taken, because all Oaths are by Christ forbidden.

The Premises being both *faulty*, his Conclusion to be sure cannot be *good*, therefore what he builds thereupon deserves the less Regard. He enumerates many Attributes of God, which he saith are acknowledged by an Oath, to which no other Answer needs be given, then that the divine Attributes are acknowledged by *speaking the Truth* without an Oath, and God thereby more glorified, in having redeemed a people from *Perfidiousness, Treachery and Falshood*, and brought them to that State of Integrity, and Uprightness of Heart, that *having put Ephes. 4. 25. away all Lying* (which was the Occasion of Swearing) they can now *speake every man Truth to his Neighbour* without an Oath.

From Reason he comes to *Consent of Nations*, the second Medium to prove Swearing an Act of Religion (Observe Reader he hath wholly let go his Hold of *Natural Religion*, which was the thing he proposed a first to prove (page 56.) and which if he fail of proving, his Heathenish Examples will stand him in no stead; but however let us hear his Instances, he begins with *Aristotle*, to whom he

he refers this Saying, *An Oath is the most venerable thing that pertains to Religion*: To Aristotle he joyns Cicero, who (he saith) gives this Account of an Oath, *An Oath: a Religious Affirmation, and what you affirm or promise by taking God to witness, ought to be kept* (so it ought whether God be taken to witness or no) and elsewhere (he saith) he hath these Words, *Our Fore-Fathers thought no Tye more fast to bind mens Faith then an Oath*. To these two he adds a third, Seneca, speaking thus, *Religion is the chief Bond of Fidelity in the Militia*: Where observe, that Seneca doth not say an Oath is the chief Bond, but Religion is the chief Bond, though he would periwade his Reader, that by Religion is meant an Oath. These are his Instances: Now let us see what Use he makes of them.

Those Testimonies (saith he) *do signify the Universal Consent of Mankind in this Point*, page 60.

Ans. Do they so? That methinks is somewhat strange, they seem then to take too much upon them. What three men (One Greek, and two Romans) to represent all Nations, and signify the Universal Consent of Mankind! Is he sure these three Men were deputed by all Nations to be their Representatives in this Case? That had been

proper

proper for him to have inquired, before he had been so positive; or doth he certainly know there were *no* ~~is~~ *amongst* ~~Mankind~~ that were of a contrary Mind, seeing he speaketh so comprehensively of the *Universal* Content of Mankind? To shew him the Rashness of his inconsiderate Assertion, I will give him some Instances to the contrary. The first shall be of *Solon* (one of the Sages of Greece)

A good man should have that Reputation, as not to need an Oath.
 Bp. Gaudea of Oaths, page 42.

Stobaeus Ser. 28.
Stob. Serm. 25.

Bp. Gaudea of Oaths page 42.
 ibid.
 ibid.

ibid.

A good man should have that Reputation, as not to need an Oath. It is a Diminution of his Credit to be put to swear. To him add Socrates (another of those seven wise men) whose Saying was, Abstain from an Oath, with him agrees Chrysostomus, No Oath ought to be used, neither a JUST one, nor an unjust one. Epictetus saith, Refuse an Oath if possible ALTOGETHER, if not by things obvious. Plato is more positive, Away, saith he, with an Oath. ALTOGETHER. Menander little less, To avoid evil Swearing, as not to swear in things JUST and TRUE. Plutarch tells us, It was unlawful for Jupiter's Priests to swear. Neither

Neither take an Oath, nor require one, said *Fimicus* to *Lollianus*. Is the better and simpler Ages of the World Oaths were seldom used in Judicature, but after that *Perfidy* and *Lying* increased, the Use of Oaths increased saith *Polybius*. ibid. idem page. 36.

Judge now, Reader, by these Instances; whether the more *virtuous* and honest sort of *Heathens* did esteem an Oath to be an Act of *natural Religion* (that is) whether they accounted it of a *Religious Nature* in it self; or whether being sensible of the *Corruption* of Mankind, they only made use of Oaths as a *Remedy* or *Expedient* against the *Perfidy*, *Treachery* and *Falshood* of Evil minded men, and therefore (as *Solon* said) *A Diminution to the Credit of a Good Man*. But of this more hereafter, when I come to speak of his third Proposition.

The former Instances are of particular Persons; Take one Instance of a Nation in general, namely, the *Scythians*, whose Ambassadour treating with *Alexander the Great*, thus deliver themselves: *Think not that the Scythians confirm their Amity by Oaths; They swear by keeping their Word: That* Q. Curt. 1.7.

is the Security of the Greeks, who seal Deeds and call upon their Gods. We are bound by our very Promise. They that fear not Men, will not stick to deceive the Gods.

Thus, Reader, thou mayest see, that not only many particular Men, but even a whole Nation in general were against Swearing. What now is become of his Consent of Nations, his Universal Consent of Mankind! Might he not have come off with less Shame, if he had used more Modesty?

But he says, *These Testimonies signify the universal Consent of Mankind in this Point.* What Point is that? *that an Oath is an Act of Religion*; for that was it he proposed to prove by them, pag. 50.

Ans. If his Instances were never so general, and his Testimonies never so universal, to prove Oaths Acts of Religion amongst the Heathen, yet it would not do his Business, unless he could also prove, that Oaths were Acts of Natural Religion, (I for cannot think him so weak headed, as to imagine, that whatsoever the Heathen did as Religious Acts, were Acts of Natural Religion.) That Oaths were used among the Heathen, and by many of them reputed Religious too, I deny not; but this doth not prove, that Oaths were Acts of Natural Religion,
or

or that the *Heathen* used Oaths *Rom. 2.*
 from a *divine Instinct in Nature.* *Vers. 14.*
 It is evident, that the *Heathen*
 borrowed many Ceremonies from their
 Neighbours the *Jews*, and used them in their
 own Religion: Will he thence infer, that
 those Ceremonies were Acts of a *Natural*
 Religion, or that they sprang from a common
 Principle of Religion in Nature? That were
 to err willingly. They had their *Images*,
 their *Temples*, their *Priests*, their distinct
Habits for their *Priests*, their *Sacrifices*, the
Ring in Marriages, wearing *Black* in token
 of Mourning for the Dead, and many other
Ceremonies. Had they these from an innate
 Principle, a Principle of Religion in their
 Nature? To acknowledge and adore a *Deity*,
 to do *Justice*, to love *Mercy*, to speak *Truth*,
 &c. These indeed are the Effects of *Natural*
 Religion; these spring from *Seeds* of Reli-
 gion sown in the Nature of Man-
 kind, and so are indeed Moral *See Acts*
 and Eternal. But there may be 17. 22,
 Wayes or Modes of performing 23.
 these which are not the Dictates *Rom. 1.*
 of this *Natural* Religion, but 21.
 are either received *praeceptively*
 from God, or invented, and *instituted* by Men

according to their own Fancy and Humour. For though it be an Effect of Natural Religion, to acknowledge that there is a Deity, and that this Deity is to be adored; yet are not all those Wayes, by which this Deity is adored, the Effects of Natural Religion; but some of them have been commanded and appointed by God, the rest invented and instituted by Men. The like may be said of *Justice*, *Mercy* and *Truth*: There is *Justice*, and the *Manner of doing Justice*; there is *Mercy*, and the *Way of shewing Mercy*; there is *Truth*, and the *Manner of speaking Truth*. Now an *Oath* is but the *Mode* or *Manner of speaking Truth* (He himself calls it, *A Form of giving Evidence*, pag. 62.) 'Tis *Truth* it self that is the main thing. To *do justly* is a moral and eternal Precept. To *show Mercy* is the like. To *speak Truth* is the like. But the *Manner of Expressing* these is not moral, not eternal. but *mutable*, *variable*, *transient*. To *speak the Truth* is an *indispensible Command*, a Command written in *Man's Heart* from the Beginning; but the *Manner of Performing* this has been various: Some times by a *bare single Affirmation*; sometimes by an *Additional Affirmation*;

tion; sometimes by calling God verbally to witness; sometimes by an *Imprecation* on the Party himself; sometimes by *putting the Hand under the Thigh*; sometimes by *lifting it up to Heaven*; sometimes by *laying it upon the Breast*; sometimes by *laying it upon the Altar*; sometimes by *laying it upon a Book*; sometimes by *Kissing the Book*, &c. Now all these (out of which an Oath is made up) are but the *various Ways and Manners of Expressing Truth*. The Oath is not the Truth it self, but a *Medium*, or Way contrived to gain *Credit* with the *suspicious* and *incredulous*, who are easily persuaded, that the Party giving Evidence, will from the Apprehension of Danger and Punishment upon Perjury, be more inclined to speak the Truth after this manner (*viz.* of an Oath) then if his Testimony should be taken upon a single Affirmation. An Oath therefore being the *Manner*, not the *Matter*; not the *Substance*, but a *Ceremony*, used only sometimes, and by some Persons, to gain Credit with the *Suspicious*, and that variously, according to *Circumstances & Occasions*, I conclude it cannot be an *Act of Natural Religion*, it cannot be a *Moral Eternal Precept*. And how far *John Gauden*, late Bishop of Exeter,

was of this Mind also, let the Reader judge by his own words, "It were to page 23. "be wisht (sayes he in his Discourse concerning *publick Oaths*) "that the Evils of Men's Hearts and Manners, the Jealousies and Distrusts, the "Diffimulations and Frauds of many *Ch. Aims*, their uncharitableness, Unsatisfactions and Insecurities, were not such, as "by their Diseases do make these Applications of Solemn Oaths & Judicial Swearings "necessary, not **ABSOLUTELY** and "MORALLY, or Preceptively (as the "School-men note well) but by way of "Consequence and Remedy; as good new "Laws are necessary for the Curb or Cure of "new Evils in Politicks and Kingdoms. Observe, Reader, the Bishop here denyes that Solemn Oaths and Judicial Swearings are *absolutely* necessary, *morally* necessary, *preceptively* necessary; and makes them necessary only by way of Consequence and Remedy, as *Applications to the Diseases of Jealousie, Distrusts, Diffimulations, Frauds, and other Evils of Mens Hearts and Manners*. How then are they *Acts of Natural Religion*? How are they a part of the *Moral and Eternal Law*?

Again,

Again, the Bishop goes on thus, "Possibly as *Christians* (truly such) we should need no Swearings in publick or private, &c. Consider now, I pray, *What Act of Natural Religion is that*, which, the more truly-*Christian* men become, the less need they have of it! How is that a *Part of the Moral and Eternal Law*, which, as men become truly-*Christian*, they shall have no Occasion to use! But I need not have gone further than his own words, to refute his Opinion of the Morality of an Oath, as an Act of Natural Religion, and a part of the Eternal Law; since he himself sayes, (pag. 61.) *If there were that Truth in men, that their bare Testimony were of sufficient Credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath: Which plainly shews, that an Oath is not an Act of Natural Religion* (as he calls it) *not a part of the Moral and Eternal Law, which is never to be abolished.* For if it were an Act of Natural Religion, an Increase of Truth in men would not render it needl^{ss}; if it were a part of the moral and eternal Law, an Increase of Truth in men would be so far from making it needl^{ss}, that it would rather confirm, strengthen and enforce it, as we see in Love, Mercy, Justice, and the like. I have
now

now done with his first Proposition, which proves *defective in all its parts.*

His second Proposition, by which he undertakes to prove Swearing lawful, is, that *An Oath is an Act of Necessary Justice and Charity towards Men.* To prove which he sayes, that *in order to the Ending of Strife, Evidence is necessary.*

A sw. Evidence is indeed necessary. But if he admits nothing for Evidence, but what is given upon Oath, he errs egregiously: for that is as really Evidence (and may be also as true and faithful) which is delivered barely by a plain Affirmation, as that which is given in the Form of an Oath. This being granted (which cannot reasonably be denied) an Oath is then *superfluous*, * and whatsoever is *superfluous* is not necessary. And indeed, amongst Good Men an Oath is needless, as the Emperor *Antonine* well observes in his Description of a Good Man, "The Integrity of a truly Good Man (sayes he) is such, that there is no need of an Oath for him. Which single Sentence of a virtuous *Heathen* were enough (one would think) to put to Shame and Silence all those
no,

nominal *Christians*, that from their Hypocrisie, Malice and Interest, infer (as this Priest does) a Necessity of Swearing.

But if he will still have Oathes to be necessary, I will shew him (from one of sufficient Authority, with him at least, I doubt not) whence that Necessity came;

For Tayler (late Bishop of Down and Conner) in his Course of Sermons lately printed, speaking of Swearing saith thus; "But let us consider who it was that inven-

Of Christian simplicity, fel. 228.

ted and made the Necessity of Oaths, &c. "These things (says he) were indeed found out by Man, but the Necessity of them was from him that is the Father of all Lyes, the Devil. Here then the Priest may see, First, Whence that Necessity at first sprang, which he labours so hard to continue and perpetuate. 2. That Oaths were invented by men, and therefore what he hath said, of an Oath being an Act of Natural Religion, and a part of the moral and eternal Law, is indeed but a meer Fancy.

But he sayes, If there were that Truth in Men, that their bare Testimony were Infallible, and of sufficient Credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath, pag 61.

Ans.

Answ. I say, If Oaths were *infallible*, that is, that they that took them could *not* deceive, could *not* chuse but speak true, then there were more Reason for the taking of them. But Oaths are *Fallible*, as well as bare Testimonies; and that the too frequent *Perjuries*, in all Ages, wherein Oaths have been used, are *infallible Evidences* of. But is nothing of *sufficient credit* with him, but what is *infallible*? If so, then neither are Oaths of *sufficient Credit*, because not *infallible*. But if he will grant, that an Evidence may be of *sufficient Credit*, although not *infallible*, he must then either deny that there is in any man that *Truth*, which may make his bare Testimony of *sufficient Credit*; or yield that there are some men from whom there is *no Need at all of an Oath*.

But he sayes, *All men are Lyars*.

Answ. I do not believe all men are Lyars, whatever he may be; and I would gladly hear in what sense he will own himself to be a Lyar.

David indeed, in his great *Affliction*, let such an Expression drop; but he quickly re-called himself, and confest it was spoken in his *Haste*. This man has been *over-hasty* too, and has caught up the word at a venture;

let

let us see whether he (who is so much for Confession) will as fairly confess his Error.

Again, he sayes, *Mankind is so generally leavened with Hypocrisie, and Fear, or Favour, Malice or Interest swayes with the far greater part of men; and therefore it becomes highly needful, that their Evidence be demanded and given in such Forms as are most binding to the Conscience, which an Oath by all the World is acknowledged to be,* pag. 61, 62.

Ans. Here observe, that from the Hypocrisie and Wickedness of men, he infers a needfulness of their Evidence being demanded and given by an Oath. Their Evidence! Whose Evidence? Their Evidence who are leavened with Hypocrisie, and swayed by Malice, Interest, &c. What is this to good men, to Christians, to the Disciples of Christ? If Fellows cannot be held without Fetters, must True Men therefore wear Shackles? Or will he reckon all men Fellows, as even now he called all men Lyes? But if it were true, that the generality of men were so leavened with Hypocrisie, and swayed with Malice, Interest, &c. as he sayes they are, and that therefore they could not believe one another's Evidence without Swearing, would it be an Act of necessary Justice and Charity

to good men, out of whom the *old Leaven of Hypocrisie is purged* (and who keep the Feast of a Good Conscience) not with that old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of *Malice and Wickedness*: but with the

1 Cor. 5. *Unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth*) to demand their Evidence also by an Oath; or for

them to give their Evidence by an Oath, and thereby implicitly acknowledge themselves to be *leavened with Hypocrisie, and swayed with Malice & Interest*, as well as the worst? For, if *Hypocrisie and Wickedness* be Reasons of demanding an Oath, does not he that, in Conformity thereunto takes an Oath, acknowledge himself to be *Hypocritical and Wicked*? Is this an Act of Justice, and a necessary one too? What sort of Justice is that, I pray, which makes No Distinction between the *Virtuous* and the *Vicious*, the *True Man* and the *False*, the *Sincere* and the *Hypocrite*, the *Good* and the *Bad*; but enjoyns the most *Sincere* and *Upright Man* to wear the *Badge of Hypocrisie*, an Oath.

But suppose this just (tho' in which what can be more remote from Justice) yet doth it not answer the *End* proposed; for an Oath doth not bind the Conscience of a man, so leaven-

ed with Hypocrisie, and swayed with Malice, Interest, &c. as he (to the Shame of his own Ministry) represents the far greater Part of men to be ; for it is not to be supposed, that he that is thus leavened with Hypocrisie, and swayed with Malice or Interest, will make any more Conscience of false Swearing, then of false Spraking ; but he that will lye in giving in a Solemn Evidence, will not stick in Point of Conscience, to add an Oath to that Lye, if it be required of him. This Bishop Gauden was sensible of, when he said, *Not*

can indeed much Credit be given any more then to a Liar, to any man that swears never so solemnly, and in Judicature, who is a Common Swearer, and hath no Reverence of the Majesty

Discourse
con. pub.
Oaths pag.
17.

of God. And what Reverence of the Majesty of God shall we suppose those to have, who are leavened with Hypocrisie, and swayed by Malice or Interest, of which Sort he repotes the far greater Part of men to be ! Yet he saith. *Multitudes, who fear not a Lye, do dread the Solomnity of an Oath, and the Horror of Perjury ; but it's much more probable, that such a Sort of men, as he hath described do rather dread the outward Penalty for Perjury,*

jury, because the Law inflicts severe Punishments on them that forswear themselves, whereas *Lyars* (the more is the Pity) go *Scotfree*.

But otherwise, as to a *Conscientious Tye*, how little they regard *Perjury*, who are addicted to *Lying*, is not only evident from the frequent *Perjuries* committed, but also observable from the Testimonies of the Ancients.

Chrysostom saith, 'He that doth not stick
'at LYING, will not fear SWEARING;
'for he that tells a Lye, goes beyond the Truth
'in his Heart; and he that SWEARS
'falsly passeth over God in his Words: what

'then is the Difference between
Hom. 12. 'passing over God, and going
in Mat. 'beyond the Truth, seeing God
5. 'is Truth it self? This is the only

'Difference, that when we LYE
'we pass over the Truth in our Heart, and
'when we FORSWEAR we pass over
'God in Words; for to men we give 'atisfaction by words, to God by Conscience.
'God himself, who forbade Forswearing,
'even he afterward commanded NOT TO
'SWEAR: He therefore that is not afraid
'to set light by the Command of God in
SWEAR.

' **SWEARING**, will not be afraid to do
 ' the like in **FORSWEARING**; but
 ' what wouldst thou have? Doth he fear
 ' God, or doth he not fear him? If he be one
 ' that feareth God, he will not **L Y E**, though
 ' he be not sworn, but if he be one that doth
 ' not fear God, he cannot speak Truth, though
 ' he be **SWORN**. Again, ' Thou deceivest thy
 ' self O man (saith he) A man that hath learnt
 ' to steal, and to wrong a man,
 ' will oftimes trample also up- *Hom. 9 in*
 ' on an *Oath*. With him con- *Alt. Apost.*
 ' sents *Isidorus Pelusiota* (who was *cap. 3.*

Comemporary with *Cyrl*) In
 one of his Epistles writing thus, ' If thou art
 ' of our Flock, and art ordered under a
 ' good Shepherd, deny the Na-
 ' ture of wild Beasts, and obey *lib. 1. Epist.*
 ' his Voice that forbiddeth to 155.

' **SWEAR AT ALL**. Moreover not to
 ' **SWEAR**, is not to **REQUIRE AN**
 ' **OATH** of another. Now if thou wilt not
 ' **SWEAR**, neither **REQUIRE** thou an
 ' **OATH** of another for two Causes; either
 ' because he who is asked loves Truth, or on
 ' the contrary to Lye; if the man speaks
 ' Truth usually, he will alwayes speak Truth
 ' **WITHOUT AN OATH**; but if he

Comment. in
Jac. 5.

*Qui non
reverentur
homines sal-
lant Deos,*

Scyth. Le-

gat. ad Alexand. in Q. Curt. lib. 72. *Qui Jura-
mentum a malo Viros. stulat, insanit, Antipho.
in Stobreo Serm. 25 Nullum jusjurandum
grave est, furi et impostori. Sophoc. in Stob.
Serm. 26.*

' be a **LYAR** he will **LYE**,
' though he **SWEAR**. To
' this agrees that of *Erasmus*,
' Whosoever dare be bold to
' lye without Swearing, he
' dares do the same also when he
' sweareth, if he list.

But he takest for granted that an Oath is
an Act of very great Justice and Charity;
therefore he saith, *Seeing the Ends of Justice
and Charity are so much served by the religious
Use of an Oath, would not the abolishing of it
derogate from the Honour of Christianity,*
page 62.

*Ansiv. First, The Ends of Justice and Cha-
rity are not served by the Use of an Oath, but
by the Use of Truth, and Sincerity in gi-
ving a true Evidence, whether it be with or
without an Oath: This Truth-speaking is the
Substance of the whole matter; this answers
the Ends of Justice exactly; but Oaths are but
the*

the Forms of giving Evidence, as himself confesseth, page 62.

Secondly, The abolishing of an Oath would not degenerate. Nay, I add, the continuing of Oaths doth derogate from the Honour of Christianity. The Honour of Christianity is, that it out-strips and excels all other Professions of Religion whatsoever: It is no Honour to Christianity to stand but upon equal terms with any other Religion, whether Heathenish or Jewish; but it mounts far above them all, and leads them that sincerely embrace it, to a Perfection beyond whatever was attainable in any of them, yet in them Oaths were attainable: It is no Derogation to the Honour of Christianity that it hath made its Adherents so Upright, just and true, that they dare not speak a Falshood, though others dare swear it. Is it any Derogation from the Honour of Religion, that the Professors of it are men of Credit, worthy to be believed (and if he allow them to be such, there is then (he confesseth, page 61.) No Need at all of an Oath) The primitive Christians (saith Bp. Gauden) did so keep up the Sanctity and Credit of their Profession among Unbelievers, that it was Security enough in all Cases to say, Christianus

Discourse concerning pub. Oaths pag. 41.

saith, I am a Christian. If any urged them further to any Oath, for matter, or manner, or Authority unlawful, they repeated this, as the ONLY Satisfaction they could give: There needed no more then the Veracity of their BARE WORD. But was this a Derogation from the Honour of Christianity? No, They kept up (saith he) the Sanctity and Credit of their Profession by this. Nay hear what he saith further upon this Subject, Certainly the Affairs of Christians, both PUBLICK and private would be NO LESS to their Honour and Ease, if there
 page 22 *were in NO CASE any need or use of ANT Oaths or Swearing, but such an Authentick Veracity, and Just Credulity on all Sides, as might WELL spare even the MOST TRUE, sincere and lawful Oaths, keeping on all Sides as great a Distancee from Lying, as from false Swearing: The abolishing then of Oaths would no way derogate from the Honour of Christianity.*

But the continuing of Oaths doth greatly derogate from the Honour of Christianity. Why are Oaths continued? Because (saith my Opponent) there is not that Truth in Men that can make their bare Testimony of sufficient Credit (for if there were, he confesseth there

there would be *no need at all of an Oath*)
 What can more derogate from the Honour
 of Christianity, then that its Followers should
 be so *devoid of Truth*, as not to deserve Cre-
 dit? Again, Why are Oaths continued?
 Because (saith my Opponent) *all men are*
Lyars, Mankind is generally leavened with
Hypocrisie and Fear, Favour, Malice or In-
terest sway with the far greater Part of Men.
 If his far greater Part of Men are such, as
 have no Relation to Christianity, his Instance
 then relates not to the matter, but if they are
 such, as by profession thereof, have Relati-
 on thereunto, *How great a Derogation is this*
from the Honour of Christianity? Doth it
 not pluck down Christianity from its Super-
 excellent Sphere, and debale it to an Equality
 with Heathenism: The most Barbarous Hea-
 then could be believed with an Oath; and
 canst not thou (*a strong grown Christian, ha-*
ving thy Religion seated in the Rational Pow-
ers, page 5.) be believed without an Oath:
 What then art thou better (in this respect)
 then the misbelieving Heathen? or how art
 thou in this Case an Honour to thy Religion,
 more then that Miscreant is to his? Let none
 therefore imagine, that the abolishing of oaths
 doth any way derogate from the Honour

of Christianity; but let all endeavour by living virtuous, just and holy Lives, and by speaking the Truth upon all occasions Plainly and sincerely, to leave no Cause nor Place for Oaths, and thereby will Christianity be adorned, and its Honour highly advanced.

But saith he, *While the Apostle saith, An Oath for Confirmation, is the End of Strife; if you take away an Oath, you take away that which by God is ordained to be the most effectual means of ending it, page 63.*

Ans. He should rather have said *was* ordained, then *is* ordained, if he had intended to deal fairly; for it was to *them* of old time under the Law (which was a State of Weakness and Childhood, and so of Contention and Strife) that Oaths were appointed; but in the New Testament, which is the Gospel of Peace, there is no such ordination, there Oaths are taken away, not ordained. Now it was to that State of Weakness the Apostle refers, when he speaks of an Oath, *Heb. 6.* for he writes there to the *Hebrews*, who had been under the Law, which shews he had Reference to the State of the *Jews*, but in all his Epistles to the believing *Gentiles*, there is no such thing to be found. Besides, he fetcheth the occasion of his Discourse in that Place from

from the *Old Time* (wherein Swearing was allowed) shewing how God confirmed his Promise by an Oath to *Abraham* ver. 13.) and then addeth (ver. 16.) *For MEN verily swear by the Greater, and an Oath for Confirmation is to THEM an End of all Strife.* He doth not say *WE* swear by the Greater, and an Oath to *US* is an End of all Strife; but *MEN* swear, and to *THEM* an Oath is an End, &c. which plainly carrieth the Intent of his Words to them that were under that State of the Law. And this will appear yet more plain, if we observe that when in the following verses, he speaks of the Heirs of that Promise, and the strong Consolation they have thereby, he doth not then use the words *MEN* and *THEM*, but *WE* and *US*. Wherein God (saith he) willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of Promise the Immutability of his Counsel confirmed it by an Oath, that by two Immutable things in which it was impossible for God to Lye, *WE* might have a strong Consolation, who have fled for Refuge to lay hold upon the Hope is set before *US*, which Hope *WE* have, &c. (ver. 17, 18, 19.) So that when he spake of what was done in in the old time wherein swearing was lawful) he expresth himself by the

words **MEN** and **THEM**; but when he speaks of what relates more immediately to the New Testament time, he expresses himself by the Words **WE** and **US**, intimating that as he distinguished between the times and States of *Law* and *Gospel*, *Old Testament* and *New*, so also he put a Difference between *Men* and *Saints*; for as in another Case, he saith, *Though we*
 2 Cor. 10. 3. *walk in the Flesh, we do not war after the Flesh*, so say I in this Case, *Though Saints are men, yet they do not walk as men*: The same which the Apostle also intimates in his Reproof to some among the *Corinthians*,
 1 Cor. 3. 3. *Whereas (saith he) there is among you Envyng, and Strife, and Divisions; are ye not carnal, and walk as men?* Here he plainly shews, that walking in *Strife* and *Contention*, walking as *Men* is not the *Saints State* but a *Carnal State*, whence we may fair'y infer, that when he speaks (in *Heb 6.*) of *Mens Swearing*, he doth not by *Men* intend *aints*, true *B lievers*, the New-Testament Church, but such as were under the *Old Dispensation* (to which *Oaths* were allowed) the *Ordinances* whereof
Heb. 9. 10 were *Carnal*, besides it chargeth an
Incongru-

Incongruity upon the Apostle himself to suppose he meant by *men's* Swearing that the *Saints* did swear, and that an Oath was to *them* an End of Strife (much more, to imagine he commanded or allowed it in *them*) when he checkt the *Corinthians* so sharply for *living in Strife*, and walking as *men*, telling them plainly, they were but *carnal*.

Nor let him or any think to take Advantage (as some without *cause* or *success* have done) from the Apostle's speaking in the present Tense (*Men [do] swear, &c.* and *an Oath [is] to them an End, &c.*) from thence inferring, that he spake this of the *Christian-state*, because he saith, *men [do] not [did]* and *an Oath [is] not [was]*; but consider that he writes to the *Hebrews*, who were of the *Jews*, amongst whom Oaths *had been* lawfully used: And therefore he expresses himself to them in the *same* Tense upon other Occasions also, which none can apply to the Gospel state, although spoken in the Gospel-time. So he sayes, *Every High Priest [is] ordained* Hebr. 8. *to offer, &c.* This must needs be 3. understood of the *Jewish Priesthood*, which (*de jure*) was at an End, and yet

yet he does not say, Every High Priest [*was*] ordained, but in the present Tense [*is*] ordained, &c. So also, speaking
Hebr. 9. of the outward Tabernacle, that
 3. was used in the time of the Law,

he sayes, *After the second Vail was the Tabernacle, which [is] called the Holiest of all.* He could not intend this of the Believers in Christ, that they did call this Tabernacle the Holiest of all; for they knew a Holier then *it*, and that *it* was at an end. But he must here be understood to speak of the *Jews*, to whom that Tabernacle belonged, and not to the *Christians*. in like manner, when he sayes, men [*do*] swear, &c. and an Oath [*is*] to them an End, &c. he must also be understood to speak of the *Jews* (to whom Oaths were commanded) not of the *Christians* (to whom they were not commanded) For there is no more Reason to apply his words in this Case to the *Christians*, then there would be to apply his words in the other Cases (here mention'd) to the *Christians*, which to do would be highly absurd & false.

But he sayes, *If you take away an Oath, you make Christ not so much the Prince of Peace, as Discord, by making him the Abolisher*

lisher of that which was designed to compose it.

Ans. No such matter: Christ hath a better Way of composing Discord then by Oaths. *Moses* had that Way,

who was but a Servant (and the *John 8.*

Servant abides not in the House 35.

forever) But Christ, who is the Son, hath a more excellent Way, by establishing Truth and Righteousness in the Earth.

The Law (in which the Oaths were) was given by *Moses*, but *John 1.*

the Grace and the Truth came by 17.

Jesus Christ. And by this Grace and Truth Christ worketh out of the Hearts of them that receive it all that *Lying, Hypocrisie, Fear, Favour, Malice, Interest, &c.*

which this Priest makes to be the Needful Causes of an Oath (pag. 62.) And instead

of *Lying*, he brings in *True-speaking*; instead of *Hypocrisie*, he brings in *Sincerity*; instead of that *insnaring*

Fear, he brings in the *Fear of* *Prov. 29.*

the Lord, by which men depart 25.

from Evil; instead of *Favour*, *Chap. 16.*

he brings in *Justice*; instead of 6.

Malice, he brings in *Love*; in-

stead of *Interest*, he brings in

Self.

Self-denial; instead of *Unrighteousness*, he brings in *Righteousness*, and the Work of Righteousness is (not *Discord*, but)

Isaiah 32 *Peace*: Thus he is made both the
17. *Lord our Righteousness*, and the
Prince of Peace. And thus by

setting up Truth and Sincerity in the Heart, he takes away the Ground of Oaths. For the Priest confesses, *If there were that Truth in men, that their bare Testimony were of sufficient Credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath*, pag 61. Now, though I will not invert the Charge upon my Adversary (which without any Injustice to him I might do) yet I will make bold to tell him, that *He shews but little Respect to Christ*, while he grounds the Need of an Oath upon *Lying, Hypocrisie and Malice*, yet would make CHRIST to continue the Use of it in his Church.

He is now come to his third Proposition, viz. *That an Oath is a Part of that Moral and Eternal Law, which our Saviour professeth he came not to destroy, but to fulfil*, p. 56. And this he infers with a *Therefore*, that is, *Because it is an Act of Natural Religion to-*
wards

wards God, and of necessary Justice and Charity towards men, *Therefore it is a part of that Moral and Eternal Law, &c.*

Answ. If nothing more should be said to this, yet the two former Propositions, on which he builds this, being before overturned, this in course must fall to the Ground: Yet nevertheless, that he may not think himself sleighted, I will take notice what he says here also. He *bestirs* himself not a little to prove that which I never yet heard any deny, namely, *that all Oaths are not Evil in themselves*, which he gravely infers from their having been once confessedly lawful, p. 63. What else is this, but to mis-spend his Time, and bestow many a *doughty Blow* upon his own Shadow? His Proposition required him to prove, that *some Oaths are Good in themselves*; and he comes so near it as to prove, that *all Oaths are not Evil in themselves*. What thinkst thou, Reader? has he not shewed his Ability? Some things are *forbidden*, because they are *Evil*; and some things are *Evil*, because they are *forbidden*: An *Oath*, we say, is therefore *Evil*, because *forbidden*. That which made it *lawful* to the Jew, was its being *commanded*; that which makes

makes it *unlawful* to the *Christian*, is its being *forbidden*.

He has another far-fetch by which he would prove *Oaths moral*, and that is, *because they are not Ceremonial*. But how does he prove they are not Ceremonial? Thus: *They were used* (says he) *by the Patriarchs before the Levitical Law was given, therefore not Ceremonial*, pag. 63.

Answ. Indeed! Was nothing then Ceremonial, that was used by the Patriarchs before the *Levitical Law* was given? Surely he consulted his own Credit more in *concealing his Name*, then in thus undertaking to prove *Oaths* a part of the moral and eternal Law, because used by the Patriarchs before the *Levitical Law* was given. Can any thing be more naturally inferred, then that he *accounts whatsoever was used by the Patriarchs, before the Levitical Law was given, to be a part of the moral and eternal Law*? And could he have found a more direct medium, to discover his own Ignorance! Was not *Circumcision* in the *Flesh* used by the Patriarchs, before the *Levitical Law* was given? Will he thence conclude *Circumcision* to be a part of the moral and eternal Law? *Why then*

is he not *Circumcised* himself? Were not Beasts *sacrificed* by the Patriarchs long before the *Levitical* Law was given? Will he thence conclude, that such *Sacrifices* are a part of the moral and eternal Law? Nay, does he not himself call those *Sacrifices*, *Types and Figures*? (pag. 50.) And are they not then *ceremonial*, notwithstanding they were used before the *Levitical* Law was given? But of this more anon.

Here he makes a Digression to fall upon some others, who, it seems, have offended him, in what they have written concerning the Nature and Power of the divine Will. He names only *Szydlovius* the *Dutch-man* but hints at some others of our own Nation, who (he sayes) by their Writings have not a little contributed to the *Debauching* of this present Age. Who these are, he does not say; but it is most probable they are some of those that for *corrupt Interests* have intruded themselves into the *Priesthood*. But be they who they will, seeing he acknowledges that this Discourse is beside our Subject, I will (at this time however) step over it, and meet him again at pag. 66. where resuming his former Argument, he sayes thus.

That an Oath is not a part of the Ceremonial

nial Law, is clear from what hath been said concerning the Morality of it, which proved it a part of Natural Religion and Justice, &c.

Ans. That which hath hitherto been said by him, to prove the Morality of an Oath, is no more then what he might have said, to prove the Morality of Circumcision & Sacrifices: That was used by the Patriarchs before the Levitical Law was given, so were these; if then that is therefore moral, because so us'd, then are these also therefore moral, because so used. But if Circumcision and Sacrifices are not therefore moral, although so used; then neither is an Oath therefore moral, although so used: So that hitherto he hath done in effect nothing towards the proving an Oath a part of the moral and eternal Law, which he must do, before he can make it an Act of Natural Religion and Justice.

Besides, he sayes here (pag. 66.) that the ceremonial Law is a System of Types and Shadows: and in pag. 50. he calls the Sacrifices that were offered by the Patriarchs, before the Levitical Law was given, Types and Figures; by which he plainly alloweth them to be ceremonial, notwithstanding they were used before the Levitical Law was given. And yet he would have Oaths to be
not

not Ceremonial, but Moral, for that very Reason, because used before the Levitical Law was given: So likewise is he consistent to himself.

But he adds, *Whatsoever was purely Ceremonial, was purely Typical, and if you cannot find in the Gospel an Antitype for an Oath, you may then be satisfied that the Command of Swearing was no part of the Ceremonial Law, page 67.*

Answ. He is a great deal forwarder to affirm than to prove. Where will he find particular Antitypes in the Gospel for all the Ceremonies in the Law? Were not the Priests Garments Ceremonial? I would know of him then, what Aaron's Breeches were a Type of? Let him find out an Antitype for them in the Gospel. And we read Moses was commanded to kill a Ram, and to take of his Blood and put it up Exod. 20.
on the Tip of the right Ear of 29.
Aaron, and upon the Tip of the
right Ear of his Sons, and upon the Thumb of
their right Hand. and upon the great Toe of
their right Foot. I demand of him what these
Ceremonies were Types of? if he can find
Antitypes for them in the Gospel, he may do
well to bring them forth; and if he cannot,
L yet

yet I would not have him thence infer, that the Command for these things was *no Part of the Ceremonial Law*, but rather consider how over hasty he was in concluding the Command of swearing to be *no Part of the Ceremonial Law*, unless an Antitype for an Oath can be found in the Gospel.

But saith he, *If you say an Oath was a Type of any thing pertaining to the times of the Gospel, shew what was its Antitype or thing represented by it.*

Ans. That I will do by and by, after I have shewed the occasion and rise of Swearing, which is the Type, Man was created righteous, holy, pure, innocent: There was no *Guile*, no *Fraud*, no *Diceit* in him; nothing but *Sincerity*, *Uprightness* and *Truth*. In this State there was no *Use* nor *Need* of *Oaths*; for while he abode in this, his *Word* was *Truth*, he spake a *pure Language*; but man falling from this State, set open a Door (as it were) to *Fraud*, *Treachery*, *Perfidy*, *Lying*, *Falskood*, &c. and thereby to *Jealousies*, *Suspicion*, *Distrusts*, *Incredulities*, &c. These being entred wrought men by Degrees to that pass, that not daring to rely upon one anothers *Words* and *Promises*, they sought other *Expedients* to secure themselves

selves by, whereof *Oaths* was one, so that *Oaths* entred through *Transgression*, for want of *Truth* and *Sincerity*; and the further men went from the *Truth* into *Falshood*, the more frequent did the *Use* of *Oaths* grow : This Bishop *Gauden* acknowledges, out of *Polybius*, In the better and simpler

Ages of the *World* (saith he) *Oaths* Discourse
were seldom used in *Judicatures*, of pub. O.
but after that *Perfidy* and *Lying* p. 36.
increased, the *Use* of *Oaths* en-
creased, &c. But this *Perfidy* and *Lying*,

as it had a time of *Increase*, so it was to have a time of *Decrease*; it was not to continue alwayes, Men were not to be *perfidious* and *false* alwayes, and consequently *Oaths* were not alwayes to last. Now when the *Gospel* comes to be preached and received (which is the *Power* of *God* to *Salvation*

to all them that believe in it) that *Rom.* 1.

purges out the old leaven of Hy- 16.

poctise, Malice and Deceit, that 1 *Cor.* 5.

cleanseth the Heart from Guile, 7, 8.

Fraud, Lying, Falshood, Perfi- 1 *Pet.* 2. 1.

dy, and all Unrighteousness;

and *renews* man into the *Image* of *God*,

bringing him again into that *Truth*, *Sincerity*

and *Uprightness* which by *Transgression*

he had lost. And man thus redeemed *speaks Truth* again, and *bears true Witness* without and Oath (and is believed too without an Oath, by all that are redeemed from Unbelief) for in this Gospel-State the

Zeph. 3. *pure Language is again learnt and*
8. *spoken* (which God by his Pro-

ver. 13. *phet promised to turn to the*
People) And there is not a de-
ceitful Tongue in the Mouth of

Ephes. 4. *those that are thus redeemed, but*
having put away Lying, they speak
every man Truth with his Neighbour.

Now this Truth-speaking, this True Witness-bearing, this Pure Language under the Gospel, is the Antitype of an Oath, the very thing that was represented by an Oath in the time of the Law, and the Antitype (the Truth) being come (which is more peculiar to the Gospel; for the Law was given by Moses, but the Grace and Truth

John 1. *came by Jesus Christ: The Type*
17. *(which was the Oath) is at an*

Isa. 45. *End. Thus what the Prophet in*
23. *the time of the Law, delivered in*
the Type by the Word Swear:

Rom. 14. *That the Apostle in the time of*
the Gospel expresseth in the An-
ntitype

Antitype by the Word *confess*; plainly shewing that the *Type was ended*: As therefore he argues, that if his Parishioner cannot find an *Antitype* for an Oath in the Gospel, he may then be satisfied that the Command of swearing was no Part of the Ceremonial Law; I by the contrary Reason infer, that having found an *Antitype* for an Oath in the Gospel, he and all his Parishioners (and all others) may be satisfied that the *Command of Swearing was a Part of the Ceremonial Law*, and so an Oath not *moral*.

He goes on thus, *The second Argument to confirm you, that Oaths are not evil in themselves, nor Part of the Ceremonial Law, is taken out of the Example of the holy Patriarchs, with whom an Oath was of authentick Use, and held sacred before the Delivery of the Levitical Law.* page 67.

Answ. Two things by this Argument he undertakes to prove, one whereof is by none (that I know of) denied, & it was wisely done of him to begin with that, namely, that *Oaths are not evil in themselves*. What makes him harp so upon this String! He could not suspect that the *Quakeos* (whom he writes against) held Oaths to be evil in themselves; for at his Entrance upon this Subject, he him-

self observed out of R. H. that they allow Oaths to have been lawful, page 32. yet not less then six times in his Discourse of Swearing, he inculcates this, that Oaths are not evil in themselves, which looks as if he designed to perswade *weak Heads* they may do any thing that is not evil in it self.

The second thing he undertakes by this Argument to prove is, *That Oaths are no Part of the Ceremonial Law, because they were of authentick Use with the holy Patriarchs, and by them held Sacred before the Delivery of the Levitical Law.*

Ans. If Oaths are therefore no Part of the Ceremonial Law, because they were of authentick use with the holy Patriarchs, and by them held sacred before the Delivery of the Levitical Law: Then by the same Reason no other thing is a Part of the Ceremonial Law which was of authentick use with the holy Patriarchs, and by them held Sacred before the Delivery of the Levitical Law; that is in short, nothing that the Patriarchs did religiously observe, before the Delivery of the Levitical Law, was Ceremonial, but Moral. This I take to be the natural Consequence of his Argument, and this I deny, let him prove it if he can. He may find (if he pleaseth) that

Circum-

Circumcision was of authentick Use with the holy Patriarchs, and by them held sacred, long before the Delivery of the Levitical Law (and somewhat too before his first Instance of an Oath) and yet I think he will not deny that *Circumcision* was a part of the ceremonial Law. *Gen. 17. chap. 21. Levit. 12.*
 What then will he think of the 3.

Sacrificing of Beasts, which was of Authentick Use with the holy Patriarchs, and by them held sacred, not only before the Delivery of the Levitical Law, but even before the Flood? will he say that *Sacrificing* was therefore no Part of the Ceremonial Law? I hope he will be more considerate.

Another touch yet he hath at this, in pag. 68. where he saith, *The Gospel Dispensation doth not repeal any Law that is Moral, &c. and such is this of a lawful Oath.* He assaies to prove it thus, *That Law whose Reason and Usefulness is perpetual, and the same to us under the Gospel, - as it was to them under the Law, is it self perpetual, and therefore not repealed by any new Dispensation.*

Ans. To be satisfied whether or no the Reason of an Oath is perpetual, we must again enquire out the Reason of an Oath, and I

will go no further at this time to fetch it, then to my Adversary's own Words (pag. 61 62.) *If there were that Truth in men, that their bare Testimony were infallible, and of sufficient Credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath; but seeing all men are Lyars, and mankind is so generally leavened with Hypocrisie, and since Fear or Favour, Malice or Interest sways with the far greater Part of men, it becomes highly needful, that their Evidence be demanded, and given in such Forms as are most binding to the Conscience, which an Oath by all the World is acknowledged to be. Observe here the Reason he gives for the Needfulness of an Oath, viz. Lying, Hypocrisie, Fear, Favour, Malice, Interest (for were it not for these, he confesseth there were no need at all of an Oath) Let us now carry this Reason of his along with us to his Argument, and see how wellfavouredly it will look there: His Argument then will run thus, *The Gospel does not repeal any Law, the Reason whereof is perpetual, but the Reason of an Oath (namely Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice, &c.) is perpetual, therefore the Gospel doth not repeal Oaths. What else is this but to establish Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice, &c. and to perpetuate them for ever, that while the World stands men*
*must**

must never cease from Oaths, because while the World stands men must never cease from Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice, &c. for if these be (as he truly saith) the Reason of Oaths, take away these, and the Reason of Oaths is taken away, and then there can be no Reason for Swearing; but these (viz. Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice, &c.) under the Gospel, and from among true Christians are taken away, at least none will deny that (*de jure*, of right) they ought to be so, therefore Oaths also under the Gospel, and among true Christians are taken away, at least (of right) ought to be so.

Besides, In making Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice, &c. the Reason, and Strife and Contention the Usefulness of Oaths, and then asserting the Reason and Usefulness of Oaths under the Gospel to be the same as it was under the Law, he greatly undervalues and debases the Gospel, rendering it as defective and insufficient to take away Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice, Strife, &c. as was the Law. Whereas the Apostle sayes expressly, that *What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the Flesh, God sending his own Son in the Likeness*

Rom. 9.

3, 4.

ness.

ness of sinful Flesh, and for Sin condemned Sin in the Flesh; that the Righteousness of the Law (which is beyond the Letter of it) might be fulfilled in Us, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit. And to the

Hebr. 7. Hebrews he sayes, The Law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better Hope did. But if

there be as much need of Oaths now, under the Gospel, as there was then, under the Law, and that for this Reason, because there is as much Lying, Hypocrisie, Malice and Strife now among Christians, as there was then among the Jews (which his words carry, and his Argument it self implies, else it is nothing to the purpose) then hath not Christ who is Heir of all, and to whom all Power in Heaven and Earth is given) done more, in this Respect, for his Disciples, then Moses (who was but a Servant) did for his: Which to suppose, would so highly derogate from the Honour of Christ, that it were too great an Impiety for any to admit, who bears the Name of a Christian.

In his Margent upon this place, he sayes, *Rationes boni & mali sunt aeternae*: i. e. The Reasons of Good and Evil are eternal.

Ans.

Ans. For what Reason he brought this Sentence, I do not see, unless he would from thence infer, that an Oath is a part of the Eternal Law, because the *Reasons of an Oath are Eternal*. But if this be his Meaning, he had need consider, that the *Reasons of an Oath* (in his own account) are, *Lying, Hypocrisy and Malice*; and I hope he will not say, *these are Eternal*. But if he will have it, that the *Reasons of Good and Evil are Eternal*, what are the *Effects of Good and Evil*? are they *Eternal* too? For, that *an Oath is the Effect of Evil*, he has already too far granted to deny.

I have now followed him to his fourth and last Proposition, by which he undertook to prove, that all Oaths are not forbidden by Christ, viz. that *some Oaths are used in the New Testament*. His Instances are of *Paul* and the *Angel*: Those of *Paul* are these which follow, Rom: 1. 9. *For God is my Witness, whom I serve with my Spirit in the Gospel of his Son, that, &c.*

Ans. To say barely and simply God is my Witness, is not an Oath. Read *Isa. 43. 10. Ye are my Witnesses, saith the Lord*; so vers. 12. *Therefore ye are my Witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God*: Again, Chap. 44. 8. *Ye are even my Witnesses, &c.* Here God is

is pleased to call men his Witnesses, as Paul in the other place calls God his Witness. Now either God in these words did swear, or he did not swear, if any will say, he did swear in saying of Men, Ye are my Witnesses, then they will make God to swear by Men, the greater by the lesser; whereas

Hebr. 6. God, whenever he is said to swear is alwayes said to swear by him-

Gen. 22. self, because he could swear by no Greater. But if God, in say-

Jer. 22. ing, Ye are my Witnesses, did not swear; it follows then, that

Paul might say, *God is my Witness*, and yet not Swear. How oft did *Moses* call Heaven and Earth to witness! Did he swear (will the Priest say) by Heaven and Earth? That was never allowed. But if this

manner of Speech be Swearing, *Acts 22.* what will become of *Paul* in another Case, where he sayes, *The High Priest does bear me witness*,

&c. Which is all one as if he had said, *The High Priest is my Witness?* Now if my Adversary will make *Paul* to swear by God, in saying *God is my Witness*, how will he avoid making him swear by the High Priest also, in saying, *The High Priest is my Witness?* Yet he will not dare to charge *Paul* di-

directly with Swearing by the High Priest (although indirectly he does) for he knows full well, that so to have sworn had been *unlawful*, even when Swearing was lawful. But if *Paul* did not swear in saying, The High Priest is my Witness, it is evident that that Form of Speech is not an Oath. Besides, how extremely absurd is this Construction of *Paul's* words! For, if I should have Occasion to say, *John is my Witness*, or *James is my Witness* that I did or said so or so; by the same Reason, by which the Priest would prove that *Paul* swore by God, in saying, God is my Witness, he may as well infer that I swear by *John* or *James*, in saying, *John* or *James* is my Witness. But his Weakness in this is too plain to need any further Detection.

His next Instance is *Rom. 9. 1. I say the Truth in Christ, I lye not, my Conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost.*

Ans. To speak the Truth in Christ, is not an Oath. In the time when Oaths were lawful, it was not lawful to swear but in Solemn, Weighty and Extraordinary Occasions: but to speak the Truth in Christ was and is lawful upon all Occasions. And indeed, if *Paul* should have sworn as oft as he spake the Truth

Truth in Christ, he would have been a very *common Swearer*. But if to speak the Truth in Christ, be not Swearing; how can it be an Oath to say, *I speak the Truth in Christ?* But this is not all; he adds, *My Conscience also bearing me Witness in the Holy Ghost*. What will he infer from hence? will he make *Paul* here to swear by his Conscience also? Doubtless *Paul* made more Conscience of Swearing then so. This however tends to overturn his former Instance: for if *Paul* did not swear by his Conscience, in saying, *My Conscience bears me witness* (or my Conscience is my Witness, which is all one) and which if he had done, he had done Evil, and his Example had not been imitable) then neither did he swear by God, when he said, *God is my Witness*.

His next Instance is, *2 Cor. 1. 18. But as God is true. And Vers. 3. Moreover, I call God for a Record against my Soul, that, &c.*

Ans. 1. In the first of these Verses (*But as God is true*) the Particle [*as*] (by which the Priest would make these words sound an Oath) is not in the *Greek* (*Πιστὶς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ὄντι, &c.*) but put in by the Translator; which they who do not read *Greek* may observe in their *English Bibles*, where they will find the

the word [*as*] in a different and smaller Print then the rest. Which *Beza* observing in his *Latin* Translation, renders it thus, *Iuno fidelis Deus novis sermonem nostrum apud vos non fuisse etiam & non.* And *Tomson*, who turned it out of his *Latin* into *English*, gives it thus, *Yea, God is faithful, that our Word to youward was not yea and nay.* From all which it may appear, that the Apostle in these words intended no more then a *solemn Affeuration* (which is not an Oath) as if he had directly said (as *Beza's Latin* runs) *God who is faithful knows, that, &c.* and as upon another Case, in the same Epistle (though with somewhat more of *Circumlocution*) he did say, *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth, that I lye not,* 2 Cor. 11. 31. (which is another Instance the Priest gives of *Paul's Swearing*) which words, though somewhat more *periphrastically* exprest, amount to no more in point of an Oath, then if he had only said, *God knows I lye not:* For the Oath (if there had been any) had lain in those two words, *God knows* (The same is to be observed in the words above-mentioned, viz. *I call God for a Record upon my Soul,*

Soul, which though it sounds a greater Earnestness, is yet no more in Substance then if he had barely said, *I call God to witness*; which barely and simply to do is *not an Oath*, as I have shewed before upon the first Instance) But how absurd is it even to think, that the Apostle *Paul*, upon no greater Occasion neither, then the recourting to the *Corinthians* the manner of his *Escape* out of *Damascus* through a *Window* into a *Basket*, should take a solemn Oath by God, that he did not lye! which if he had taken, he had done Evil, even in the Priest's own Account. For he sayes, *It was one of the Erroneous Glosses of the Pharisees, that it was lawful at any time to swear by God's Name, so that they swore nothing but Truth, and performed their Oaths unto the Lord*, p. 77. and this, he acknowledges, *Christ prohibited*, p. 78. But the Use and Lawfulness of Swearing, which he sayes remains, is, *when a man is called by lawful Authority * to declare his Conscience, in order to the ending of any of Authority one of the due Circumstances which are necessary in a lawful Oath*, p. 45.

Con

Controversie, wherein his Evidence may be concerned, pag. 84. Now then, let us consider, If Paul had sworn (which he did not) who called him to it? who required it of him? Nay, what lawful Authority had the Corinthians over him if they would have done it) to require an Oath of him? Next; What Need was there of an Oath, can any think the Corinthians so incredulous (or the Apostle so out of Credit) that they would not have believ'd Paul without an Oath especially in a Case of no greater Moment then this was? The Priest himself (in a Case much more to be doubted) sayes to his Parishioner, I hope you will believe me without an Oath, pag. 46. And does he think Paul had not as much Reason to expect the Corinthians would have believed him without an Oath? Methinks he might at least allow Paul as much Credit as he takes to himself. He confesses, pag. 61. If there were that Truth in men, that their bare Testimony were of sufficient Credit, then there were No Need at all of an Oath. And it seems he thinks so well of himself, that his bare Testimony was sufficient, and therefore hopes his Parishioner wil believe him without an Oath But he is not willing to allow this to Paul. No: Paul must swear at every turn (though none require it of him) So that (if he will be con-

sistent to himself) either he must say, that Paul had not that Truth in him, that his bare Testimony (though in a small matter) was of sufficient Credit ; and therefore that it was Needful for him in these Cases to swear (and so bespatter the Apostle) or he must grant, that Paul had that Truth in him, that his bare Testimony was of sufficient Credit , and therefore that he needed not to have sworn (for, Swear he sayes he did) and so make the Apostle to have sworn needlessly, that is, (even in his own Account) unlawfully. Besides, that which he sayes is the Use of an Oath was also wanting in this Case, namely, Controversie ; for we read of no Controversie among the Corinthians concerning Paul's Escaping out at a Window into a Basket. So that, from Top to Bottom, this, if it had been an Oath, had been a false one : And the like is to be said of his other Instances. Thus he would make the Apostle an Offender, not only in swearing at all (which I say is Evil) but also in swearing Needlessly, Uselessly and Unrequired (which he himself sayes is Evil) What therefore he hath said, concerning Paul's Swearing, is not to be believed, because it is false ; nor were to be imitated (if it had been true) because it had been Evil.

yet

Yet he is earnest to have the Instances of Paul taken for Oathes, becaule he saith, that in every of them Paul makes a most solemn Appeal to God, &c. page 70.

Ans^r. If to appeal to God, be to swear by God, then by the same Reason, to appeal to man or any other thing (in the same Sense) is to swear by that man or thing, that is so appealed to. What the Consequence of this would be, I will shew him out of his own Book, p. 110. *He appeals to his Parishioner's Conscience*. According then to his own Saying, he might be said to have Sworn by his Parishioner's Conscience; but what would he think of that? He knows full well that had been unlawful, whensoever Oaths were lawful. Again, saith he to his Parishoner, page 65 *I appeal to your own Faculties*. Here is an Appeal, and a Solemn one too, for ought appears; for he seems to be in earnest, yet as eager as he is for Swearing, I can hardly think he would offer to Swear by his Parishoner's Faculties.

But he saith, that those mentioned Forms used by Paul were as positive Oaths (here again he calls an Oath a Form as he did before, in pag. 62. though he will not have it a Ceremony) as any other you find in the Bible. or any of those that are imposed upon you by the Law of

the Land, page 72.

Ans. Take notice that none of those Expressions which he hath brought to prove that Paul swore (and as many more of the like Nature, which with as much Reason he might have brought) were used by Paul in any publick Court of Judicature, nor was he called therto by any Lawful Authority (or indirectly called at all by any Authority) to declare his Conscience, in order to the ending of any Controversie, wherein his Evidence was concerned (which is the only lawful Use that the Priest gives of Swearing now under the Gospel, page 84.) but were only used by Paul in his Communication with his Brethren in the Letters which he writ to them for their Instruction and Edification. If therefore in these Instances Paul had sworn, he had not sworn judicially and legally, but in his ordinary Communication, which kind of Swearing (viz. in Communication and unrequired by lawful Authority) is on all Hands acknowledged and even by this Priest himself, page 76, 77.) to be forbidden by Christ, and consequently evil: So that to say those Forms of Speech, which Paul used, are as positive Oaths as any in the Bible, or as any now used in this Land, is no better then if he had positively said that Paul did positively sin in Swearing
be in

being neither thereto call'd, nor in due Cases.

But that he and all may see, it is not our Judgment only that *Paul* did not swear, I here produce two very authentick witnesses, to clear *Paul* from swearing. The first is *Basil*, surnamed the great who himself refused to swear at the Council of *Chalcedon*, and commended *Clinias* a Greek, for suffering a Fine of three Talents (which he might have avoided if he would have sworn) He upon *Psalms* 15. saith, *There are some speeches which have the Forms of Oaths and yet are NO OATHS at all, but rather Remedies to perswade.* He instances in *Joseph*, and the Apostle *Paul*, of which last, he saith, *The Apostle willing to shew his Love to the Corinthians said, By the glorying of you which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord; for he did not depart from the Doctrine of the Gospel, &c.* thus *Basil*. The other is *Gregory Nazianzen*, in his Dialogue against Swearing, thus. B. *But Paul also swore, as they say.* A. *Who said so? O what a vain fangler was he that said it! quoth he, God is my Witness, and God knoweth; Those Words are not an Oath, but a certain Affe-
vation, &c.* Thus *Nazianzen*. So that, if

what I have said before were not sufficient, lo here a couple of credible Witnesses step in to clear Paul's Innocency in this particular, from the Aspersions of all vain-Janglers whatsoever.

His last Instance is of the Angel swearing, Rev. 10. 5, 6. And this he introduces with more then ordinary Pomp, saying, *We need not fear to imitate any thing that is done in Heaven, where nothing but the Will of God, nothing evil & unholy can be done*, page 72.

Ans. But by his leave, this was not done in Heaven, but on Earth, for the Angel which swore stood upon the Sea, and upon the Earth, verse 5. Now the Sea is the Emblem of the Wicked, as saith the Prophet, *The Wicked are like the troubled Sea, when it cannot rest, whose Waters cast up mire and Dirt*. There is the Strife and Contention, which the Oath was of old to end. The Earth also represents *Worldly-minded men*, who are thence called *Earthly-minded*; but the Saints are redeemed from the Earth, and have their Conversation in Heaven, where to be sure there is no Swearing, nor need

of

of it ; for the Priest must not forget that he hath said (page 61.) *If there were that Truth in men that their bare Testimony were of sufficient Credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath, and yet would he fetch an Instance from Heaven of Swearing ? We need not fear (saith he) to imitate any thing that is done in Heaven.* Doth he imagine then, that there is Swearing in Heaven ? What ! If there were not Truth enough in men, does he think there is not Truth enough in Angels neither, to make their bare Testimony of sufficient Credit ! what a strange Notion hath he got of Heaven and Angels.

Besides, though he confidently saith, that God hath proposed the Angels to us as *Patterns* for our imitation, I must take the Liberty to tell him plainly he mistakes, and that in the very Case in Hand, which I thus demonstrate : In the time of the *Mosaick Law*, among the Utensils of the Tabernacle (and afterward of the Temple) there were *Censers*, on which the *Levit. 16.* Priests were to *burn Incense* before the Lord, that this was Part 12.
of the *Ceremonial Law*, and as such abolished by Christ, the concurrent Judgment, and Practice of all Parties confirms; which notwithstanding

standing, in the same Book of Revelation we read, that an *Angel* came and stood at the *Altar*, having a *Golden Censer*, and there was given unto him much *Incense*, that he should offer it with the *Prayers* of all *Saints* upon the *Golden Altar*, which was before the *Throne*. Now then say I, if the Example of the *Angels* are proposed to us for our imitation, and that it is lawful (as the *Priest* argues) for us to swear, because we read that an *Angel* swore in the time of the *Gospel*, then by a parity of Reason, it is lawful for us to have a *Censer* as they had under the *Law*, and to offer *Incense* thereupon before the *Lord*, as they then did, because we read that an *Angel* so had and did in the time of the *Gospel*; but if to use such a *Censer* now would be *Jewish and unlawful*, notwithstanding the *Angel* used one; then to use an *Oath* now, would for the same Reason be *Jewish and unlawful* also, notwithstanding the *Angel* used one. In short, he can no more prove it lawful to swear now, because an *Angel* swore, then he can prove it lawful to burn *Incense* now, because an *Angel* burnt *Incense*.

I have now done with his Instances, and I hope to the Reader's Satisfaction. I should now

go directly to those two Texts in *Matthew* and *James*, but for a passage or two which lie in my way, and I am not willing wholly to pass over

The first is this, he saith, That every Oath implies an Execration, i. e. a Cursing, or be-taking oneself to the Devil (as *Rid. r* expounds the Word) which makes an Oath more unsuitable to the Nature of the Gospel, which teacheth to bless, not to curse, but this is not all. He adds, Execration is implied and understood even in those elliptical Forms of swearing used by God himself, page 71. This I cannot brook, that he should thus charge God with using an Execration (that is, wishing a Curse) upon himself, which how great a Blasphemy it is against the divine Nature and Majesty of God, will more evidently appear, if we consider, that it tends to make the most high God acknowledge some other Being superior to himself; for he who execrates (or wisheth a Curse upon) himself, doth thereby own a Power above himself, which is able to bring or execute that Curse upon him as is plain from *2 Sam* 3. 9. & 35. *1 Kings* 2. 23. By this Reader thou mayst see what horrid Absurdities, that Wisdom which descendeth not from above (but is earthly and sensual

sensual to be sure, if not worse, *James 3.15.* runs some of these learned Rabbies into.

The other Passage I take notice of is this, He saith, *The laying on of the Hand, and kissing the Book, we hold to be no essential Parts of an Oath, but only decent and comely Ceremonies, &c.* I wish the Magistrates in all Counties would read this, and reflect upon those many great Fines, and sore Imprisonments inflicted by some of them upon many of us, even sometimes to the loss of Life, for not complying with those things, which are by this man asserted to be *no essential Parts of an Oath, but bare Ceremonies*; that from this Consideration they may be induced, for the future to exercise more *Moderation & Gentleness*, and not expose their honest Neighbours to so great *Sufferings* for meer *Ceremonies*, when the Sum & Substance is effectually answered by *our speaking the plain and naked Truth in the Presence of God.*

I am come at length to those two notable Texts, *Matthew 5. 34. Swear not at all. And James 5. 12. Above all things my Brethren swear not.* These stand like two immoveable Rocks, against which all the Contenders for Swearing have hitherto been split: These two Bishop *Gauden* confesseth to be
Notable

No able Texts, which seem to stand as the Angel of the Lord against Balaam, with a Sword in their Hand to stop the Way of any Swearing whatsoever; The Priest however (being as bold, and not less blind then he of old) will venture on, come off again as he can.

Discour.
of pub.
Oaths,
pag. 20.

First he attempts to prove that *those Words of Christ [Swear not at all] cannot bear a general Interpretation, but must be taken with a limitation. Why so? You are not to suppose,* says he, *that 'tis our Lord's Design to forbid all manner of Oaths, &c. (Yes say I, I do more then suppose so, and demand of him why I should not suppose so) because as has been already shewn (saith he) St. Paul had not only then been faulty in making so honourable mention of an Oath, Heb. 6. 16. but much more faulty in taking an Oath himself, and then, both he and the Angel, had fallen under the Charge of Antichristianism. page 75.*

Ans. So then, the proof he offers here (against our general Interpretation of Christ's Words [Swear not at all] to forbid all manner of Swearing, and for his own Limitation of those Words, to forbid some Swearing only, not all) is neither more nor other

ther, then what he saith, *he hath offered before*, namely the Instances of *Paul* and the *Angel*; which Proofs of his, being before in this book sufficiently (as I conceive) disproved and enervated, his *conceited* Limitation, and whatsoever he shall build thereon, must inevitably fall to the Ground, unless he hath any other *Prop* to shore it up for a while, which I do not find he hath; for he goes on thus, *Seeing our Saviour in that Gracious Law of his hath forbidden nothing that is morally good, nothing that is either indifferent or expedient, it must needs follow that an Oath is no further forbidden, then as it is evil, &c.* So that herein he offers no further proof, but as weakly as willingly takes the matter for granted, and thence infers a Consequence; but he is not like to carry it so: Three things therefore I offer to his (if he please) and the Reader's Consideration, from these words of his. 1st. that he doth herein most meanly beg a Concession, that an Oath is morally good, which yet I will not grant him, and which he hitherto hath not, nor ever will be able to prove. 2^{dly}. That as if he already began to despair of being able to maintain his Assertion of the Morallity of an Oath, he is now making way to hook it in, under the Notion of Indifferency (*Our Savi-*

our forbad nothing that is indifferent (saith he) Surely he comes down apace, who from calling it an Act of *Natural Religion*, a Part of the *Moral and Eternal Law*, is already come to talk of its being *indifferent*; and yet herein he may see him'self at a Los too, if he observe that in the same Sermon, our Saviour forbad the use of a *Trumpet*. Mat. 6. *per in giving Alms*, which in it self was a thing indifferent. So that he spoke unadvisedly when he said our Saviour forbid nothing that is indifferent. 3d'y. That in taking for granted that *an Oath is expedient*, he again begs the Question, not only of the *Expediency*, but *Lawfulness* of it also; for though some things may be *lawful*, which are not *expedient*, yet nothing can be *expedient*, which is not *lawful*, so that in calling it *expedient* he calls it *lawful*, which is the matter in question: He therefore concluding upon bare (and withal false) *Suppositions*, his Conclusion is of no Validity at all to prove his *Limitation* of Christ's Words to forbid *some Oaths only*, not all.

His next Essay is to set forth the erroneous Glosses of the *Scribes, Pharisees and Jewish Doctors* in the Case of Swearing, One (he says) *was that it was lawful to swear by the Creature*

Creature as oft as they pleased and that such Swearing (though falsely) was no Perjury The other, That it was lawful at any time to swear by God's Name, so that they swore nothing but Truth, and performed their Oaths unto the Lord. To the confuting these Doctrines (saith he) our Saviour accommodated his Answer in the Verses following. Against the first of them, viz. Swearing by the Creature, he opposeth that Prohibition in the 34, 35, 36. Verses; But I say unto you swear not at all, neither by Heaven, &c. Against the latter, viz. Swearing by the Name of God in their ordinary Communication, he gives this Precept, ver. 37. Let your Communication be yea, yea, &c. Thus far the Priest, page 77 78. and this is all he admits our Saviour to have forbidden: So that (secundum hunc) our Saviour did not forbid any thing that was commanded by Moses, but only condemned & forbid the Erroneous and false Glosses whereby the scribes Pharisees and Jewish Doctors had deviated from the Law of Moses.

Ans^r. To refute this fond Conceit, I will first oppose to this, what Bp Gardin has said in this Case, and let these two Earthen Pitchers dash one against another. He saith, our Saviour gives many singular Lessons or Precepts of more eminent

nent, Diligence, Patience, Discourse
 Charity, Mortification, Selfdeni- of publick
 al, Sincerity, Conspicuity, Perse- Oaths, p.
 verance and Perfection of Obedi- 27.

ence required now under the Gos-
 pel, above what either the Letter of the Mosai-
 cal Law seemed to exact, or by the Pharisaical
 Interpretations were taught to the Jews. Let us
 now observe the Difference between these
 two Rabbies: The Priest limits Christ's words
 to the false Glosses only of the Pharisees, &c.
 The Bishop saith, Christ gave Precepts of more
 eminent Sincerity, and Perfection of Obedience
 required now under the Gospel, above, not only
 the Pharisaical Interpretations of the Law, but
 even what the Letter of the Mosaiack Law
 seemed to exact. Here then the Bishop hath
 laid the Priest flat. Now if Moses command-
 ed to abstain from all but solemn Swearing up-
 on weighty Occasions, and yet Christ required
 more then he, then it follows that Christ re-
 quired to abstain from solemn Swearing also.
 If Moses forbid all that kind of Swearing,
 which the Pharisees taught, namely by Crea-
 tures, and in ordinary Communication, and yet
 Christ forbid some swearing more then Moses,
 then it is most plain that Christ forbid some
 kind of swearing more then that which the
 Pharisees

Pharisees taught, namely *Solemn Swearing*. That Christ did forbid more then the Law of *Moses* forbad, besides the Bishop's Testimony before cited (which perhaps with my Opponent may have some weight) is clear from the other Instances in *Mat. 5.* as in the Case of Murder: *Moses* said, *Thou shalt not kill*; Christ saith, *Thou shalt not be angry*. In the Case of Adultery, *Moses* said, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*; Christ saith, *Thou shalt not look upon a Woman to lust after her*. *Moses* here forbad the Acts of Adultery and Murder; Christ forbids the very Acts tending towards those Acts. In the Case of Divorce, *Moses* suffered it if a man hated his Wife, *Deut. 24. 3.* or for light Causes, *Mat. 19. 3. 8.* but Christ cuts short that Liberty, which *Moses* for the hardness of their Hearts had given, and restrains the Cause of Divorce to *Fornication only*. So that we see here Christ did not only forbid more then *Moses* had forbidden, but also that he forbad something which *Moses* had allowed; either of which is of Weight enough to cast the Cause to our Side, and make the Words [Swear not at all] an *Universal Prohibition of all Swearing*; for if Christ did forbid more then *Moses* did forbid, and yet *Moses* did forbid

forbid *all but solemn Swearing* by the Name of God in weighty matters, then it is plain, that Christ did forbid *that solemn Swearing* also. Again, if Christ did forbid *some Swearing* which *Moses* had allowed, and yet *Moses* had allowed *none but solemn Swearing* by the Name of God, in weighty matters, then it is clear that Christ did forbid even *that Solemn Swearing* also.

But to make it yet more evident, that Christ in those Words, *Swear not at all*; did intentionally forbid *all Oaths*, even those which *Moses* had commanded: let it be considered, that the very Phrase of Speech necessarily implies an *exceeding* or *out doing* of what was done before; an Instance of which, we have in *1 Kings 12. 11.* (*My Father, saith Rehoboam to his People, chastized you with Whips, BUT I will chastize you with Scorpions*) where the Particle [*But*] imports an *higher Degree* of Chastizement, a Degree of Severity beyond what his Father had used, and was so understood by the People, upon which they revolted, so in this Place, Christ saith, *it hath been said to them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself, BUT I say unto you swear not at all.* As if he had said, *Moses* said, *Do not forswear*, but I (who am greater than

N *Moses*

Moses, and whose Ministration exceeds in Glory, the Ministration of Moses)

2 Cor. 9. *say, Do not swear at all: Moses*

3. *forbids false and vain Swearing, but I (who go beyond Moses) forbid all Swearing; Moses allowed of some Swearing, but I (who am to*

Col. 1. *have the Preeminence in all things)*

18. *allow no Swearing at all. And indeed if Christ should have forbid*

no more then Moses before him had done, but should have allowed the same Swearing to his Followers, that Moses did to the Jews, wherein would he, who ought to have the Preeminence in all things have had any Preeminence of Moses, in the Case of Swearing?

Besides, in restraining this general Prohibition of Christ, to the erroneous Glosses of the Pharisees only, the Priest will render the Words of our Saviour Christ *Superfluous* and *Vain*; for all agree, that *Moses* had forbidden, not only *false Swearing*, and *vain Swearing*, when he said, *Ye shall*

Lev. 19. *not swear by my Name falsely*
12. *neither shalt thou prophane the*

Deut. 6. *Name of thy God, but Swearing by Creatures also, when he com-*
13. *manded*

manded them to *swear by the Name of God*; so that the false and erroneous Glosses of the *Pharisees* were before forbidden by *Moses*, and they are therefore called the *erroneous Glosses of the Pharisees*, because the *Pharisees* did therein err from the Law: He therefore that shall *restrain* and *limit* Christ's words to forbid *only* the erroneous Glosses of the *Pharisees*, will make Christ to speak after this manner, *Ye have heard that Moses said of old, Thou shalt not swear falsely, nor vainly, nor by Creatures, but I say unto you, You shall not swear at all falsely, nor vainly, nor by Creatures.* How idle and impertinent would such a Speech have been? How much below the Wisdom of a Man, much more the *Wisdom of God*! yet this is the plain Consequent of limiting Christ's Words to forbid *only* the erroneous Glosses of the *Pharisees*, or *no more* then *Moses* had forbidden before him, and yet this (as absurd as it is) is the Interpretation my Adversary gives, page 79. *The Prohibition* (he saith) *is limited to those things the Jews were wont to swear by, as Jerusalem, the Temple, the Altar, the Head, &c.* whereas the Opposition (which is implied in the adversative Particle *BUT*) standing, not between *Forswearing* and *Vain* or

Creature-swearing, but between *Forswearing* and *no Swearing*, shews plainly that Christ intended to *forbid all Swearing*; for it is as if he had said, *Moses forbade some Swearing*, but *I forbid all Swearing*: *Moses allowed some Oaths*, but *I allow none*. *Moses permitted more causes of Divorce*, then I do; *Moses allowed Eye for Eye, Tooth for Tooth, Blow for Blow*, but *I allow no such thing*; *Moses allowed Swearing in some Cases*, but *I allow it in none*. Thus doth the Gospel *out-shine* the Law, thus doth the Son *excel* the Servant, and bring in a Righteousness *beyond*, not only that of the *Scribes and Pharisees*, but even of the *Mosaick Law* also.

But as the Priest would restrain the Words of Christ, *Swear not at all*, to the abuse of the Tongue in *common Talk*, and *Communication*, page 81. So the Words of the Apostle James, *Above all things my Brethren swear not, neither by Heaven, nor by the Earth, nor by any other Oath, &c.* these also will he not let pass without a *Limitation*. The Apostle, he saith, doth mean only *all Oaths of that Kind there mentioned*, namely by any *created being*, page 82. And this he would infer, from the Apostle's leaving out some of those

those Instances which our Saviour mentioned (as *Jerusalem, the Altar, the Temple, &c.*) and breaking off with this Clause, *Nor by any other Oath.*

Ans. The contrary may with much better Reason be infer'd from hence ; for these Words are exclusive of all Sorts of Oaths. No Oath whatsoever, whether true or false, by God or Creature, Solemn, or Vain, can escape the Reach of these Words.

But he saith, *Without Doubt St. James offers as a Repetition of our Saviour's Doctrine, and that he forbade only such Oaths, as our Saviour had forbidden.*

Ans. 'Tis true indeed ; he did forbid only such Oaths as our Saviour had forbidden, and he could forbid no other, because our Saviour had forbidden All, advancing his Followers into an higher State then ever Oaths were used in (for Oaths were but as Expedients to supply the Defect and Weakness of a shadowy and legal State) and this the Apostle well knew. But if we well consider the manner of his expressing himself, we shall find he speaks so full and home to the Purpose, as if he had either met with or foreseen the Tricks and Devices which have since been used to elude Christ's Command. For,

after he had first given a *general Prohibition* (*Above All Things, my Brethren, Swear No.*) and then particularly forbidden the *Erroneous Glosses* of the *Pharisees*, namely, *Swearing by Creatures, &c.* (*neither by Heaven, neither by the Earth*) that he might be sure to leave *No Oath unforbidden*, he closes up his Sentence with these *comprehensive words*, *Neither by any other Oath.* Thus does the Disciple *explain* and confirm the *Doctrine* of his Master. And herein doth the *Wisdom* of God shine forth, in that the *Apostle*, repeating his Master's *Doctrine*, which himself in the Mount was an *Ear-Witness* of, should be directed by the *Holy Ghost* so to express himself, that if any should fancy Christ's Words not *so general a Prohibition*, as indeed they were, but should think he allowed of *some other Oath*, though he condemned those of the *Pharisees*, they might here be *convinced* of their *Mistake*, and assured that he allowed neither those Oaths used by the *Pharisees*, nor any other Oath whatsoever. And moreover, to take away all *Occasion of Stumbling*, and leave nothing whereon such a *Mistake* might be grounded, it is observable, that the Word *Communication*, which is used by our Saviour (*Let your Communication be Yea, yea; nay,*
nay;

*may: for whatsoever is more then these, co²
 meth of Evil, Mat 5. 37.) and from which
 very Word they that contend for Swearing
 do wrest Christs Meaning from a general
 Prohibition of all Swearing, to a particular
 Prohibition of Swearing in Common Talk or
 Communication, is not used by the Apostle
 (but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay;
 lest ye fall into Condemnation, Jam, 5. 12.)
 as if the Holy Ghost had designedly omitted
 it, to secure this Text from the like Violence.
 But to go on.*

*The Priest sayes, Christ told them, that in
 ordinary Communication, those plain Affirma-
 tions of Yea and Nay, are enough to give
 Credit to what we say, if we would use our
 selves to speak Truth.*

*Answ. And if men would use themselves
 to speak Truth, would not this be enough
 to give Credit to what they say in all Cases?
 For if Truth be spoken, what more can be
 desired in any Case? He said himself, but a
 little before (speaking of the most solemn
 Use of Oaths) If there were that Truth in
 men, that their bare Testimony were of suf-
 ficient Credit, then there were no need at all
 of an Oath, pag. 61. And has he so soon
 N 4 forgot*

forgot himself? Nay, he sayes now again, pag. 83 *While St. James saith; Let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; his Meaning is, Let your Promise be Performance, and let your Word be the Truth, to the end that among all with whom you converse, you may be believed without an Oath.* If this be indeed the Apostle's Meaning (*as indeed I believe it is*) with what Face can any say he allowed Swearing in some Cases, who renders it so utterly Needless in all? For, if their Promise was to be Performance (that is, the thing promised was to be as safe and sure, as if it were already performed) if their word was to be the truth (then which there cannot be more in the most solemn Oath) and if the End why it should be thus, was this, that among all with whom they conversed, they might be believed **WITHOUT** an **OATH**; what room, I pray, did the Apostle then leave for any Oath at all? Will not such a Promise as is Performance, such a Word as is the Truth, reach all Cases, serve all Occasions. and answer all Ends in Humane Society? *Then farewell Swearing.*

Thus have I cleared the words of our blessed Saviour, and his Holy Apostle, from the

the *erroneous Glosses* of the *Pharisees* of this Age, who say, that Christ and his Apostle did forbid *no more* but the *erroneous Glosses* of the *Pharisees* of that Age: I shall now give the Reader a few Instances, by which he may see, what was the Judgment of the primitive *Christians* in this Case, and to draw this Chapter to a Conclusion.

P. Ilycarpus (who lived in the time of the Apostles) being requir'd by the Magistrate to Swear by the Fortune of *Caesar*, refused, giving *Eusebius*, l. 4. c. 13. this only Reason, *I am a Christian*, and was therefore Burned to Death.

Basilides (a Roman-Soldier, who led *Pontamiena* to Execution, and by her constant Martyrdom was turned to Christ) being required to swear, refused it utterly, plainly affirming, that it was not at all lawful for him to swear, because he was a *Christian*; for which he lost his Head. L. 6. c. 4.

Or *gen*, speaking of those Particulars which Christ forbade to swear by (as *Heaven*, the *Earth*, the *Altar*, &c.) says, 'These things Christ speaks to the *Jews*, forbidding them to give heed to the Traditions of the

‘the *Pharisees* : otherwise (sayes he) before, Christ manifestly forbad to SWEAR
 ‘AT ALL.

Basil, surnamed the Great, on
 This in *Psal.* 14. ‘Lord, who shall a-
 our Eng- ‘bid: in thy Tabernacle ? He
 lish Bibles ‘that Swaereth, &c. (hath these
 is the 15. words) ‘Here (*viz. in the Law*)
Psalms. ‘he seemeth to allow an Oath to
 ‘a Perfect Man, which in the
 ‘Gospel is altogether forbidden ; But I say
 ‘unto you, Swear not at all. In this place,
 ‘sayes he, the Prophet is contented with an
 ‘Oath, if it be just and true : but our Lord
 ‘cuts off the very Occasion of Forswearing.
 ‘For even he that swears truly, may perad-
 ‘venture be deceived some time or other ;
 ‘but he that never swears at all, is out of
 ‘all Danger of Forswearing.

Gregory Nazianzen, in his Dialogue a-
 gainst Swearing, discourses thus, ‘B. What
 ‘if I use an Oath unwillingly,
 B and A ‘but to free me from Danger ?
 denote the ‘A. Let another allow thee that
 Persons (as much as to say, Be the Dan-
 speaking. ger what it will, I cannot allow
 thee to Swear) ‘B. What if we
 ‘be drawn by Necessity to give an Oath ?
 A.

'A. Why didst thou not rather dye? for
 surely thou shouldst rather Dye then
 do it And that he speaketh here of ALL
 OATHS, even the most solemn, ob-
 serve what he sayes a little before; 'B. But
 'what wilt thou say to me of the Old Cove-
 'nant? surely it doth not prohibit an Oath,
 'but requires a true one. A No Wonder;
 'at that time only it was prescribed in the
 'Law concerning Murder; but now it is not
 'lawful, for any Cause, so much as to smite
 'or beat: then the End of an Evil Deed on-
 'ly came into Judgment, but now that also
 'which moveth to the End. This (*says he*)
 'is my Judgment. Observe his Way of
 Reasoning, from the Instance of *Murder* to
 this of *Swearing*, that as in the Case of
 Murder there's *more* forbidden by Christ then
 was by *Moses* (for *Moses* forbad the *End*
only of Evil, sayes he, but Christ forbids
that which moveth to that End) so also in the
 Case of Swearing, there is *more* for-
 idden by Christ then was by *Moses*, which could
 not be, unless *all Swearing* whatsoever were
 forbidden by Christ.

Epiphanius sayes, 'In the Law, as well as
 'the Gospel, it is commanded, not to use
 'another Name in Swearing: but in the
 'Gospel

' Gospel he commanded not to Swear, nei-
 ' ther by Heaven nor Earth, nor other
 ' Oath ; but let Yea be Yea, Nay,
 ' Nay ; for what is more then the'e is of E-
 ' vil. Therefore I suppose, that the Lord
 ' ordained concerning this, because of some
 ' men's Allegations, that would swear by o-
 ' ther Names ; and first, That we must not
 ' Swear, no, not by the Lord himself, nor
 ' by any other Oath, for it is an Evil Thing
 ' to SWEAR AT ALL.

Chrysostom says ' A Christian must avoid
 ' Oaths by all means, hearing the Sentence
 ' of Christ, which saith, It was said to
 ' them of Old, Thou shalt not Forswear,
 ' but I say unto you, Swear not at all. Let
 ' none say therefore, I Swear in a just Matter :
 ' It is not lawful to swear, neither in a JUST
 ' nor Unjust Thing. Again, says he, ' If
 ' to swear TRULY be a Crime, and a trans-
 ' gressing of the Commandment, where shall
 ' we place Perjury ? Again (speaking to
 ' them that tender Oaths to others) ' But if
 ' thou fearest nothing else (*saves he*) at least
 ' fear that Book which thou takest in thy
 ' Hand, bidding another swear, and when
 ' thou turnest it over, and mark'st what Christ
 ' hath there commanded concerning Oaths,
 ' Trem-

'Tremble and forbear. *Qn-st.* What doth
 'it then say of Oaths there? *Ans.* But I
 'say unto you, Swear not at all. Dost thou
 'make that Law an Oath, which forbids to
 'swear? Oh injurious! Oh unjust thing!
 This cannot be understood of *vain* Oaths;
 for it is evident he speaks here of *Judicial*
 Oaths, taken upon the *Bible*. Again, 'What
 'then if any require an Oath, and impose a
 'Necessity of Swearing? Let the Fear of the
 'Lord be more forcible to thee (*says he*) then
 'all Necessity or Compulsion: for if thou
 'wilt alwayes object such like Occasions,
 'thou wilt keep none of those things which
 'are commanded. Again (reproving the
 Clergy-men for tending the Bible to be
 sworn upon) he says, 'If it were well done
 'to swear, ye said rightly that we gave them
 'the Gospel to Swear, not to Forswear: But
 'now ye know, that it is a SIN even to
 'SWEAR WELL, how can ye be acquit-
 'ted that give the Occasion of sinning against
 'God? And a little after, 'Be these things
 'spoken of them that Swear by God, but —
 'every one commits Idolatry, who swears
 'by any thing besides God, if it were AT
 'ALL lawful to Swear.

To these might many more Testimonies be
 added,

added, such as that of *Justine Martyr*, Christians ought not to swear *AT ALL*. Those other of *Chrysostom*, It is not lawful to swear *AT ALL*, nor to bring a *NECESSITY* of an Oath: And again, He (viz. Christ) forbids, not Perjury only, but to Swear *AT ALL*. So that of *Origen*, A Man that lives according to the Gospel, should not swear *AT ALL*. That of *Lactantius*, A Good Man will not swear falsely, lest he mock God; nay, he will not so much as swear at all, lest at one time or other he fall, even by Custom, into Perjury. That of *Hierom*, The Truth of the Gospel doth not admit an Oath. See *Ganden's Discourse of Oaths*, p. 42.

By this time I hope I have satisfied my Reader, that to refuse all manner of Swearing is no new Doctrine, nor contrary to the Primitive Christian Faith. Let me add one Testimony of a modern Writer, a Man of no mean Account in the *English Church* (and therefore perhaps more cogent to my Adversary) namely, *Jer. Taylor*, Bishop of *Down and Conner*, in his Course of Sermons lately printed: 'Our blessed Lord (sayes he) 'would not have his Disciples to swear at all (not in publick
 Of Christian-simplicity, fol. 228. lick

'lick Judicature) if the Necessity of the
 ' World would permitt him to be obeyed.
 ' If *Christians* will live according to the Re-
 ' ligion, the Word of a *Christian* were a
 ' sufficient Instrument to give Testimony, and
 ' to make Promises, and to secure a Faith,
 ' and upon that Supposition Oaths were use-
 ' less, and therefore forbidden; because there
 ' would be no necessity to invoke God's
 ' Name in Promises or Affirmations, if men
 ' were indeed *Christians*, and therefore in
 ' that Case, it would be a taking in vain.

Here is much Matter in few Lines, which
 I desire the Reader to observe: 1. This Bi-
 shop sayes expressly, That *Christ would not*
have his Disciples to SWEAR AT ALL;
 no, not in publick Judicature, if the Necess-
 sity of the World would permit him to be obeyed.
 2. In these last words, he very plainly im-
 plies, That *they who swear in publick Judica-*
ture, do therein disobey Christ, whatever Ne-
cessity they may plead for it. And by this Im-
 plication he again asserts, that *Christ did for-*
bid all Swearing, though it were in publick Ju-
dicature. This then overturns the very
 Foundation of that feeble Fabrick, which
 my Adversary the Priest hath been all this
 while

while railing for an Oath to lodge in. For if it be true, that Christ did (as this Bishop understands) forbid *all sorts* of Oaths whatsoever, then that must needs be false which the Priest says, namely, That Christ did not forbid *all* Oaths, but *only* the erroneous Glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees. Nor is that all; for if it be true (as the Bishop understands) that Christ did indeed forbid *all* Oaths, then that is false which the Priest says, namely, that Oaths are Moral and Eternal. But there is yet more in the following words of the Bishop's Testimony, *If Christians* (says he) *will live according to the Religion, the Word of a Christian were a sufficient Instrument to give Testimony, and to make Promises, and to secure a Faith, and upon that Supposition* (adds he) *Oaths were useless, and therefore forbidden.* Observe here, that he does not say, *If Christians could live according to the Religion*; but, *if Christians will live according to the Religion* [which implies, they not only *ought* so to live, but also *may* so live] then the Word of a Christian were sufficient without an Oath, even in publick Judicature; and upon that Supposition Oaths were useless, and therefore forbidden.

This

This manifests beyond all Contradiction (of them that allow this Bishop's Testimony) that Christ did *forbid all manner of Swearing*, when he said, *Swear not at all*. For without all doubt, Christ intended that his Disciples, those that were called by his Name, *should live according to the Religion they profess*, should be Christians indeed; which if they were, he knew their bare word would be *sufficient* to give Testimony to make Promises, and to secure a Faith, and consequently that an Oath would be altogether *useless*. It would therefore be *unreasonable*, as well as *unrighteous*, to imagine that Christ did allow any Oath at all to his Disciples, since that were to suppose that he either *permitted them to live contrary to the Christian Religion*, or that he *allowed them to take Oaths though useless*; which had been, to *take God's holy Name in vain*. Thus, Reader, thou seest, that what the Priest hath said to prove Oaths lawful, is denied & disproved by a Bishop of his own, and *Swear not at all* proved to be an universal Prohibition of *ALL Oaths whatsoever*.

That I may now therefore draw this Chapter to a Period; seeing it is already proved,
 O that

that an Oath is not an Act of Natural Religion (But was used of old as a Remedy only to restrain those Mischiefs, which Perfidy and Lying have brought amongst men. (as the Bishop of Exeter notes out

Discourse of Polybins) That it is not need-
of publick ful amongst Good Men, nor bind-
Oaths, p. ing to Wicked Men. That it is
36. & 23. no part of the Moral and Eternal
Law. That it is positively and

generally forbidden by Christ, not practised or countenanced by Paul, or any other of the Apostles, but expressly forbidden by the Apostle James, denyed and witness'd against even to Martyrdom by the primitive Christians, and rejected by holy Men in the best Times of the primitive Church. What remains, but to dehort all from the Use of a thing so greatly derogatory from the Honour of Christianity? For if Solon could say, A Good Man should have that reprove, as not to need an Oath; and

that it is a Diminution to his Credit (though but an Heathen) to be put to swear (as the said Bishop of Exeter observes) If the Athe-

Val. Max. nians would not suffer Xenocrates to Swear, though in a Case
l. 2. c. 10.

of Evidence, because *He was a Man of Eminent Virtue and Integrity*: If the Heathenish Romans did not exact Oaths of their Idolatrous Priests, accounting it an Unworthy Thing not to believe a Man of so great Sanctity without an Oath (as the same Bishop also notes) How pag. 41. great a Diminution of Credit then, how foul a Reproach & Blemish must it needs be to them that denominate themselves Christians (who if they be truly so, are all Priests to the only true God) that they cannot be believed without an Oath? What greater Dishonour, what blacker Infamy can be cast upon the Christian Religion, by the most malicious and crafty Enemies it has, then to say, its Adherents (even the most Conscientious of them) are not fit to be trusted without an Oath! which yet, alas! (how shameful soever it be) is the unavoidable Consequence of Imposing Oaths on the most Just and Virtuous of them.

CHAP. VII.

*Of Taking Texts, Studying Sermons,
and Selling them to the People.*

THE next thing the Priest takes in hand to treat of, is their Manner of Preaching from a Text, which he brings in after this manner; *You pretend your selves (sayes the Parishioner to him) to be the Apostles Successors and Imitators; if so, how comes it to pass, that you preach not as they did; but single out a Text, out of which you compose your Sermons? what Warrant have you for so doing?* To this he replies, *The Apostles themselves took Texts out of Scripture, to expound and apply them: St. Peter did so in his Sermon, Acts 2. and St. Paul in the Synagogue at Antioch, Acts 16. (I suppose it should be Acts 13. for in the 16th chapter there is no such thing.)*

Ans^w. If he and his Brethren have no better Warrant for singling out a Text, and
composing

composing their Sermons out of it, then these Scriptures afford, their Practice will appear to be very weakly grounded. For Peter took no Text at all, but began his Speech thus, Ye Men of Judea, and all ye that are at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words; for these Men are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third Hour of the Day. No man I think will take these words to be Peter's Text: yet if any should, I desire him to shew me whence Peter took them. But if this be not Peter's Text, then Peter began without a Text; for this is the Beginning of his Sermon. 'Tis true, in the progress of his Discourse, he takes notice of several Passages of Scripture, though not naming the places; and if from hence the Priest will infer he took a Text, he may with the same Reason say, he took half a Dozen Texts together: for I think he referred to not fewer then half a dozen several Scriptures in that short Sermon of his.

But he sayes, Both Peter and Paul also preacht Christ out of the same Text, namely, Psal. 16. 10.

Ans^r. That Peter does mention the words

in *Psal. 16. 10.* I grant; but that he took them for his Text, or *composed his Sermon out of them*, I deny: for he was *beyond the middle* of his Sermon, *before* he mentioned those words of the *Psalmist*. How then could they be his Text? The like is to be said of his other Instance of *St. Paul*. He took *no Text* neither, as appears plainly *Acts 13. 16.* where he thus began, *Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience; The God of this People of Israel chose our Fathers; &c.* and so he goes on to give an *Historical Account* of the Dealings of God with that People, until the time of *Christ*, and many Passages of Scripture he refers to in; *Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah*, and the *Psalms*; yet did not take any of them as a Text to *compose his Sermon out of*. But as for that place, *Psal. 16. 10.* (which the Priest would have to be his Text) he mentioned it not at all till he had well-nigh done his Sermon, so far was he from making that his Text, or *composing his Sermon out of it*. These Instances then afford *no Warrant* for the Priest to take a Text, and *compose his Sermon out of it*. And that which he next offers is as little (or less) to the Purpose.

He says, *The whole 4th Chapter to the Romans*

mans is but an enlarged Discourse upon, Gen. 15. 6.

Ans. If he does not mean that Paul took Gen. 15. 6. for a Text to compose that Chapter out of, he speaks nothing to the Business: But if he does mean so, he discovers the greater Weakness. For what can it be but Weakness in any one to imagine, That the Apostle, in writing an Epistle, after he had gone so far in it as the three first Chapters, without a Text, should take a Text to compose the 4th Chapter only out of, and then go on again without a Text; especially considering, that that Epistle, when he writ it, was one intire piece, not divided, as it now is, into Chapters and Verses? But if he will needs have it, that Paul took Gen. 15. 6. for a Text, out of which to compose this Chapter, because in this Chapter that Passage is mentioned; he may not only say the same of other Scriptures referr'd to in the same Chapter, but with the like Reason infer, that the Apostle, in that Epistle, took twice as many Texts as the whole Epistle is divided into Chapters, since more then so many places of Scripture are in that Epistle referr'd to.

But, as suspecting the Authority of his

own *Instances* he adds two more, *which*, he sayes, *were produced by Dr. Sherlock*, whom he represents as *speaking worthily, and like himself.*

Ans. Who Dr. Sherlock is I know as little as I do who my present Adversary is: But this I know, that my Adversary has gone at least *half as far* as that Doctor; for he has *spoken like himself*, though *not worthily*. But let us see the *Instances*.

One is of Christ, who (he sayes) took a Text, and *preacht upon it*, Luke 4. 17, 22. The other is of Philip, who (he sayes) took a Text which the Eunuch read, Acts 8. 30.

Ans. • To the Instance of Christ, I say, first, That it was in the time of the Law, and suitable to that Ministration; when Reading and Expounding the Law and the Prophets was a part of the Jewish Service: But it is not a *sufficient Warrant* for the like Practice in the time of the Gospel. 2. That it is no where recommended by Christ, or any of his Apostles, as an *Example* or *Pattern* for Gospel-Ministers. 3. It is a particular Case (for in all the Sermons that our Saviour preacht, while he was upon Earth, we do not read the like) and the Priest himself sayes, p. 127. *When any Text*
hath

hath a Relation to a particular Case, that Text must not stand for a general Rule: for it is a grand Fallacy (he sayes) to draw an Universal Conclusion from Particular Premises.

To the Instance of *Philip*, I answer, That he did not take a Text to preach on, but opened that Scripture which the Eunuch was reading, and that too at his Request. *Philip* did not single out any Text to compose a Sermon out of; but hearing the Eunuch read that Scripture, and being desired by the Eunuch to inform him in the Meaning of it, he thereupon took an Occasion to preach Christ to the Eunuch. He abuses his Reader therefore, in saying, *Philip* took a Text: for it is evident that Scripture in *Isaiah* was of the Eunuch's choosing, not *Philip*'s. So that if he will needs have it, that a Text was taken, he should rather have said, *The Eunuch* took one; for he was reading it when *Philip* came to him. These Instances therefore afford him no more Warrant for his Practice of singling out a Text, and composing Sermons out of it, then the former; so that if this be all they have to say, the Doctor and he are still to seek a Warrant for their Practice.

But he falls fiercely (and foully too) upon *Rich. Hubbertorn*, for the Reply he made
to

to Dr. Sherlock, which he sayes was in these words, *O thou Enemy and Slanderer of Christ and the Apostles! Did they take Texts to get Money with them, and to lie a Quarter of a Year or Half a Year in a Text? Christ came to fulfil the Scripture, and the Apostles shewed how he fulfilled the Scripture. And this he calls a Brutish Reply, and sayes, Did Dr. Sherlock any where lay such a Slander upon Christ and his Apostles, as to say, they took Texts to get Money with them, or to lie Half or a Quarter of a Year in them, as this Man so injuriously infers? Who then, think you, is the Slanderer? and who stood at this Man's Elbow to dictate unto him that wretched Untruth?* p. 88.

Ans. For all his big words I would have him take notice, that he deals very unfairly with us, in reporting a Reply of R. H's, and not quoting the Page, nor so much as Book out of which he takes it; therein falling short of the common Honesty of every fair Adversary. Yet will I not therefore (as I justly might) pass over this place unanswered; but supposing the words to be truly recited, I say thus: Our Charge against the Priests is not only and barely for taking Texts, and composing Sermons out of them (though
for

for that having no divine Warrant, they are condemnable) but also for *selling those Texts and Sermons to the People for Money*. Thus making a Trade of the holy Scriptures, they lie some of them three, some six Moneths in a Text; and what, by the Helps of Invention and Study, they gather into their Understandings that by Measure they *sell out* to the People, taking some Ten, some Twenty, some Forty Shillings and more, for an Hour's Discourse. This is Matter of Fact, and too Notorious to need Proof. Dr. Sherlock (as he calls him) to defend the Practice of the Priests, urges the Examples of Christ and Philip: Whereupon R. H. replies, *Thou Enemy and Slanderer of Christ and the Apostles, did they take Texts to get Money with them, and to lie a Quarter of a Year or Half a Year in a Text*. As if he had said, If thou dost bring the Examples of Christ and Philip to justify the Priests Practice in taking Texts to get Money with them (*as you Priests do*) and in lying a Quarter or Half a Year in a Text (*as some of you do*) thou art a Slanderer and Enemy of Christ and the Apostle: for did they ever do thus? Now, this being our Charge against the Priests, not only that they

take

take Texts, but that they *make a Trade* of the Scriptures, *taking Texts to get Money by, &c.* Doth not Dr, Sherlock, in bringing the *Examples of Christ and Philip* to justify the Priests Practice, plainly intimate he intends, that *they took Texts as the Priests do?* What else then is that, but implicitly to infer, that *they took Texts to get Money by?* So that if the Case be truly stated and rightly considered, it will appear that *the Doctor did slander Christ and Philip* (in urging their Examples to justify so bad a Practice) not *R.H. the Doctor*. But I observe my Opponent does not at all deny that the Priests take Texts to get Money with them : but stepping over that, he insists a little upon the other part of the Charge, namely, their lying a Quarter or Half a Year in a Text, which (says he) *I think very few do, nor any but when their Text hath such plenty and variety of Matter in it, as requires much Time in the handling of it. &c.* So that, at least, the one part of the Charge he grants, and the other he does not deny.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Humane Learning, Divine Inspiration and Revelation.

HAVING briefly dispatcht the Business of *taking Texts, framing Discourses on them, and selling those Discourses for Money;* that which comes next under Consideration is *Humane Learning*; which the Priest asserts the *Necessity* of in interpreting the Scriptures, pag. 90. He takes an Occasion to enter upon this Subject, from some words of R. H. which (as he sets them down: for he names no Book) are thus, *The Scribes and Pharisees were Learned Men, and they could not open the Scriptures; Peter an Unlearned Man, he opened the Scriptures,* pag, 87. At this he carps, saying, R. H. *magnifies the Learning of the Scribes and Pharisees, and makes a very Ignoramus of St. Peter, &c.* p. 88.

Answ. He had no Cause to quarrel at this; for R. H. spake but the Truth. He did not magnifie the Learning of the Scribes and Pharisees, but barely said, *they were Learned Men,*

Men, which none that understands what they were, will deny : Nor does he any whit debase St. Peter (as this Priest doth unfairly insinuate) but barely sayes, He was Unlearned; and so indeed he was in that sort of Learning wherein the Pharisees were learned, to which his being unlearned is opposed.

But sayes he, Will t'ey prove that St. Peter, who opened the Scriptures, was an Unlearned Man?

Ans. The Scripture sayes it expressly, Acts 4. 13.

Is there no Difference, sayes he, betwixt Peter the Fisher-man; and Peter the Disciple?

Ans. Yes; there was great Difference, but not in point of Humane Learning: The Difference lay not there. He had no more of that Learning when he was a Disciple, then he had when he was a Fisherman. But the great Difference lay in this, that when he was a Fisherman, he was Carnally-minded; but afterwards, being a Disciple, he became spiritually-minded, having received an Understanding, not from Study and Natural Means, but from God, as another Apostle
1 John 5. said, We know that the Son of God
20. is come, and hath given us an Un-
derstanding;

derstanding, that we may know him that is true, &c. For Luke tells us, that a little before his Ascension, he opened their Understandings (which Luke 24. was an immediate and inward O. 45. peration of his Spirit and Power upon them) That they might understand the Scriptures. And this Coloss. 1. it is the Apostle Paul desired for 9. the Colossians, viz. A spiritual Understanding.

He goes on, Had Peter been so long with him, that spake as never man spake, and is he still unlearned?

Ans. Yes, unlearned still in humane Learning, as much as he was before; for Christ did not instruct him in that, neither did the Excellency of Christ himself lie in that; for when he spake as never man spake, it was not in respect of Humane Learning, but of Divine and Heavenly Wisdom.

Did the Holy Ghost, saith he, give him the Tongue of the learned, nay a Portion of the Cloven Tongues, by which he spake all Languages, to enable him to expound the Scriptures to all Nations, and is this Peter unlearned still?

Ans. Yes, he was unlearned still in hu-
mana

mane and *acquired* Learning ; for that which was given him by the holy Ghost, was not *humane* nor *acquired*.

Dost he not say (adds he) that the Unlearned, and Unstable wrest the Scriptures to their own Destruction, and is he himself Unlearned ?

Ans. Yes, he himself, notwithstanding all this, was Unlearned in *that* Learning, by which they, who were Unlearned in the Heavenly Learning, did wrest the Scriptures.

Now that this may not seem strange, I desire the Reader to consider, that there is a *two-fold* Learning, Knowledge, Wisdom, and Understanding. There is a Learning that is acquirable by *natural* Study and Industry, and this is called *Natural*, or *Humane* Learning, and this Learning, Man as Man, though never so ignorant of God, or never so great an Enemy to God, is capable of ; *this Learning Peter was Unlearned in.* And there is a Learning which is given by, and received from God, without the Help or Means of Natural Study and Industry, and this is called *Divine* or *Heavenly* Learning ; and this the *Natural* Man is not capable of, but he *only*, that is *led by and taught* of the Spirit, *In this Learn-*

Learning Peter was well versed. So also there is a *Twofold Knowledge*. There

is a *Knowledge*, which he that en-
creaseth, *increaseth Sorrow*, but
there is also a *Knowledge*, of which
the *Fear of the Lord is the Begin-*

ning (or principal Part) In like
manner there is a *Twofold Wis-*

dom: There is the *Wisdom of*
the World, and the *Wisdom of*

God. There is a *Wisdom by which*
the World knew not God, and there

is a *Wisdom by which God is*
known: There is a *Wisdom*

that is not from above, but is
Earthly and sensual, and there is

a *Wisdom* that is from above,
that is *Pure, Peaceable, &c.*

There is also a *Twofold Under-*
standing: There is an *Under-*

standing by which the things of
God cannot be perceived, an *Un-*

derstanding which God will de-
stroy: And there is an *Under-*

standing which the *Inspiration of*
the Almighty giveth. Now this

Divine, this *Heavenly Learning* (this *Spiri-*
tual Knowledge, Wisdom and Understand-

Ecles. 1.
18.

Prov. 1.
7.

1 Cor. 1.
21.

James 3.
15.
ver. 17.

1 Cor. 2.
14.

1 Cor. 1.
19.

Job 32. 8.

ing) Peter *had received of God* ; in this he was *indeed* learned, and by this *sufficiently* able to understand the Scriptures, but that *humane* Learning, that that was acquirable only by *Natural* Study, and Industry, that he was *unlearned* in, notwithstanding he

Acts 4. was a Disciple, as appears plainly in the place before quoted.
13.

No Ground at all then had the Priest so *scornfully* to insult, and *vainly* triumph over R. H. as he doth, nay it more nearly concerns himself to beware, lest while he is *glorying* in that Learning, which the *Pharisees* of old (whom Christ called *blind Guides*) did so greatly *dote* upon, and wherein he seems to Place his Strength, he fall himself into that *Ditch*, which his *Envy*, and *Evil Nature* hath assigned for others.

He takes upon him in the next Place to open and explain those Words of the Apostle, 2 Pet. 3. 16. *In which are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest, as they do other Scriptures, to their own Destruction.* Upon these words he makes four Observations.

The first is, that some Passages of Scripture are so obscure and dark: that they are hard to be understood, page 20. from whence he infers
the

the Necessity of Learning (I for Distinction sake will call it *Natural, Humane, or School-Learning*) in the *Interpreting of Scriptures*, the great *Danger of misinterpreting them without it*, and therefore that they that want it, are very unfit to be *Preachers, and Interpreters of the Holy Word of God*.

Ans. Thou seest here Reader, to what a *Pitch* he hath advanced humane Learning, as if the Scriptures could not be rightly understood without it. *Not a Word of the Spirit of God*, but humane Learning *all in all*. There is a *Necessity of it*, he saith, great *Danger of misinterpreting without it*, yea they that want it are very unfit to preach, &c. What could he have said more to magnify humane Learning! but as Children use with one Blaft to blow up a Bubble, and with another to Blow it down again, so this Man, after he hath with one Hand so exalted Learning, as that without which there is no safe interpreting of Scripture, and consequently no certain Knowledge of the will and mind of God therein exprest, with the other Hand pulls it down again, and renders it as needless in Relation to man's eternal Happiness, as before he asserted it not only needful, but even of absolute Necessity. Hear what he saith, page 92.

The Parishioner asks this Question, *Are then the necessary Points of Religion in the Scriptures hard to be understood?* No (saith he) they are not; for whatsoever is necessary to Salvation, either to be believed, or to be done, are in some Place or other of holy Scripture, fitted to the most vulgar Capacity, and shallowest Understanding, as (for Example) the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension is, as necessary to be believed, so plain to be understood: Then the Duties of the first and second Table of the Law and the Love of God and our Neighbour; all the Evangelical Precepts, and the Essentials of Religion, are in the Gospel made such easie Doctrines, that he that runs may read them, being fitted to the Capacity of the most unlearned. Where now is this grand Necessity of humane Learning? The necessary Points of Religion, he saith, are not hard to be understood, whatsoever is necessary to Salvation, either to be believed or to be done, is in some Place or other of holy Scripture fitted to the most vulgar Capacity, and shallowest Understanding. The History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension, is plain to be understood; The Duties of the first and second Table; the Love of God and our Neighbour

bour (on which Christ said, the whole Law and the Prophets depend) *Mat. 22. 40.* All the Commands of the Gospel, and the Essentials of Religion: All these he confesseth, are in the Gospel made such easie Doctrines, that he that runs may read them: Nay, he saith, they are fitted to the Capacity of the most unlearned. Are they so ! what, and yet a Necessity of humane learning still ! to what End I would fain know ? why, to enable men to preach the Gospel (for saith he, They that want this Learning, are very unfit Persons to be Preachers, and Interpreters of the holy Word of God, pag. 90.) This is strange indeed (more strange then true I am sure) If all things necessary to Salvation, if all things that men are required either to believe or do, are fitted to the most common Capacity, and to the shallowest Understanding ; if the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension is so plain to be understood ; if the whole Law and the Prophets ; if all the Commands of the Gospel ; if all the Essentials of Religion, are in the Gospel made such easie Doctrines, that he that runs may read them ; in a Word, if all these things are fitted to the Capacity of the most unlearned (as he affirms they are) then I hope men may

P 3

preach

preach any or all of these without the Help of
humane Learning. If so, where then is the
Necessity of humane Learning, without which
he saith, Men are very unfit to preach the word
of God? Is there any *Necessity* of preaching any
 thing that is not *necessary* to Salvation; any
 thing that is neither to be *believed* nor *done*;
 any thing that is *no Part* of the *History* of
 Christ's *Birth, Death, Resurrection and As-*
cenſion; any thing that is *no Part* of the *Love*
 of God and our Neighbour (which as I ſhe-
 wed before comprehends the whole Law and
 the Prophets) any thing that is *no Command*
 of the Gospel; any thing that is *not Essential*-
 al to Religion? No man I think in his right
 Wits, will ſo affirm. If then there be no *Ne-*
cessity of preaching any thing, that is not
 comprehended within these particulars, and
 whatsoever is comprehended within these
 particulars may be preacht *without the Help*
 of humane Learning, what room hath he left
 for that *Necessity* of Learning, which but even
 now he contended for! Thus
 Prov. 14. like Solomon's Foolish Woman, he
 1. hath pluck'd down his House with
 his own Hands.

Nor hath he yet done, he goes on thus,
 page 93. And this reminds us of our Duty of
 Thank-

Thankfulness to our great Law-giver, in that he hath made those Doctrines most plain, which are most necessary to be believed, and those things least necessary which are most difficult, as for Example, saith he, it is not necessary to Salvation to be knowing in all the Circumstances of the Levitical Rites, nor in all the Genealogies of the Scripture, nor in all the Apocalypticall Prophecies, and therefore the Obscurity of them need not dismay us.

Ans. It seems then, those Doctrines which are most necessary to be believed, are plain enough to be understood, and preacht without humane Learning; and that Learning is only necessary to the understanding of those things which are least necessary, which how little it conduces to prove a Necessity of humane Learning in a Preacher of the Gospel, I leave to the Reader's Judgment.

He said before (page 86.) *Our only work is to explain and apply the written Word of God.* He said but now (p. 92, 93.) *All things necessary to Salvation, all things to be believed or done, all Gospel-Precepts, all Essentials of Religion (with many more particulars there mentioned) are plain and easie to the shallowest Understanding, to the most unlearned) and so have no Need of explanation)* he saith now,

those things which are *most difficult* (and so have *most Need* of explanation) are *least necessary*. Compare now these three Sayings one with the other, and see if the direct Consequence of them be not this, That *their* (I mean his, and his Brethrens) *only Work* is to explain, and apply those things, which are *least necessary* to be known ; nay, which indeed are not at all necessary to Salvation, are neither to be believed nor done, are no Gospel precepts, nor essential to Religion. O that all People would take Notice of this ! that they might no longer spend their Isa. 55.2. money for that which is not bread, nor their Labour for that which satisfieth not.

From this I pass on to his second Observation (on 2 Pet. 3. 16.) not finding any thing further in this that is remarkable, save that in page 94. he again acknowledgeth, that those Passages in Scripture that are of the greatest Concern, are written in such a plain and familiar Stile, that the weakest and most illiterate, or unlearned (of which number a greatest Part of the Members of the Church are) shall never be able to excuse the Neglect of them, the Omniscient Author of the Scriptures (which is God) herein graciously condescending to the shallowest Capacities, &c. All which makes
still

Still more and more against the Necessity of humane Learning.

His second Observation is, *That the Scriptures have been wrested*, page 95. This being matter of Fact, he concludes to be sufficiently known without further proof, and therefore having spent a Page or two in *exclaiming* against the *Quakers*, and some others (but them especially) for wresting them, he goes on to his third particular, whither I also follow him, not doubting but by that time this Subject is discusst, I shall prove his second observation for him, by an *undeniable Instance* of himself, perverting these Words of *Peter*.

His third Observation was, *the Causes why the Scriptures are wrested, which he makes twofold, want of Learning, and of Stability. I begin* (saith he) *with the first, namely, the want of Learning, which is derided by Hubberthorn*, page 97.

Ans. It had been but fair for him to have given some Instance of R. H's. deriding Learning. R. H. was not a man apt or inclinable to deride any, being a *grave, serious, solid, weighty* man, as they who best knew him can bear witness, nor is it our manner to deride, or any way undervalue Learning, which

which in its Place we know to be good and serviceable, but when others do so much over value it, and lift it up so high above its proper Sphere, as to make it the only Key, by which divine Mysteries can now a dayes be opened; that, without which the Gospel cannot be preacht, &c. We are then necessitated to pull it down, and reduce it to its proper Station and Service, which is to be conversant in Natural, Civil, or Humane Affairs, where while it is exercised, we are far from deriding or under valuing it: that we give it that Esteem which is due unto it, as a Natural thing, and in our outward Occasions, make use of it our selves, so far as we have Understanding in it, which together with our Endeavours (though through great Difficulties) to educate our Children therein, may sufficiently evidence our regard to Literature, and that our Exception lies not against Learning it self, but against the Abuse of it. This I thought needful here to be hinted, to rectifie the mistakes of any concerning us in this Case.

He goes on thus, *You are here to take special Notice (saith he) that Learning is by the holy Ghost declared so necessary for the understanding of difficult Passages in the Scriptures*

tures, that the Cause of the wresting them is attributed to the want of it. This he saith, but doth not so much as attempt to prove.

Answ. That Learning is necessary I grant, but the Question is what Learning: If he doth not mean *Natural, Humane, or School* learning, such as the *Scribes and Pharisees* were skilled in, he equivocates; but if he doth mean such Learning, I deny his Proposition. I deny that *Natural Learning, School Learning,* such as is acquired by Art, Study and Industry, is the Learning here by the Holy Ghost declared necessary. If want of *Humane Learning* were the Cause why the Scriptures are wrested, how comes it to pass that they are wrested by those that have *Humane Learning*? for if we look back into former Ages, we shall find that the Scriptures for the most part have been wrested by learned men, great Schollars, acute Wits, men of much Study and Reading, as by the *Rabbins*, and Jewish Doctors of old, the *Bishops and Clergy men* in the *Arrian* and other Controversies; the *Cardinals, Jesuits and Popish Priests* in latter times. How came it to pass that these men wrested the Scriptures? was it for want of *Humane Learning*? that could not be; for that most of these men were profound Schollars
great

great *Linguists, University men, men of much Reading, and great Learning*, is undeniable, and yet these are the men, that of all others have wrested the Scriptures *most frequently, and most perniciously*: What was the Reason of this? surely if Humane Learning had been designed by God, as the *proper and necessary means* of understanding the Scriptures aright, they who had so much of that Learning should have understood them better then they did, then whom none hath ever understood them *worse*, nor is it a thing to be wondered at by any, who shall consider the words of Christ, *I thank thee O Father,*

Luke 10. *Lord of Heaven and Earth,*
21. *that thou hast hid these things*
from the wise and prudent, and

hast revealed them unto Babes; even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight. Here then is the true cause why these *learned men* wrest the Scriptures; They seek to understand them by that *Wisdom* from which the true Sense of them is hid; they trust too much to their Brain Knowledge, and Humane Learning, and with that undertake to interpret Scripture, not waiting for the Guidance of the Holy Spirit, whose Office *alone* it is to lead into all Truth. Experience therefore shews
by

by the Errors of learned men in all Ages, that *Humane Learning* (whatever this Priest says) is not the Key that can open the Scriptures aright, none having more missed of the true Sense of them, then they that have sought it by that Learning.

But saith he, *Though the Apostles were unlearned when Jesus called them, yet to the Eternal Honour of Learning, he made them learned in all Tongues by a Miracle, before he sent them abroad to teach all Nations; teaching us thereby, that men wholly illiterate are not fit to preach the Gospel.*

Ans. This at first Sight, makes a shew as if it had something in it; but look well upon it, and it appears to be but a meer empty Flourish. *Christ* (he saith) *by a Miracle made his Apostles learned in all Tongues, before he sent them abroad to teach all Nations.* Well, what doth he infer? *Teaching us thereby* (saith he) *that men wholly illiterate are not fit to preach the Gospel.* Herein is a Fallacy, he should have said (if he would have said any thing to the Purpose) that men wholly illiterate, are not fit to preach the Gospel to all Nations, which if it were true (as it is not; for illiterate men may speak by Interpreters, which also was in use in the Primitive Church) what is it to the

1 Cor. 14.
27.
Purpose?

Purpose? If not having *all Languages* they should not be fit to preach to *all Nations*, because *all Nations* could not understand their Speech, will it therefore follow they are not fit to preach to *their own Nation* that doth understand their Speech? But these Words [*All Nations*] he was willing in the last Clause to leave out, that he might beguile the ignorant into a Conceit that none but Book-learned men can preach the Gospel; but though he may twattle after this rate to his Parishioner (whose *Respects* to his *Person* may perhaps induce him to swallow any thing that comes from him) yet let him not think to *impose* such *Sophistry* upon us, as ignorant as he takes us to be; we understand Words better then so. The Gift of Tongues to the Apostles doth not imply, that men wholly illiterate, are unfit to preach the Gospel. What was the End of the Gift of Tongues? was it to give the Apostles themselves the *Knowledge* and *Understanding* of the Gospel? was it to enable them to preach the Gospel *sincerely* and *truly*? or was it that they might express themselves to the Understandings of these several Nations to whom they were to preach? They were commanded to preach the Gospel to *all Nations*, which that all Nations might *understandingly* hear

hear, it was expedient it should be preacht
 unto them in their respective *proper* Languages, which that it might be, the Use of
 Tongues was requisite, and therefore given
 unto them, who were designed to that so
Universal Ambassage: Observe then, Reader,
 what was indeed the *very* Reason, and
proper Service of Tongues, namely, that *all*
Nations might hear and understand what was
 spoken: So that the Gift of Tongues was
 not designed to enable the Apostles to preach
 the Gospel, in such a Sense, *as if they had not*
been able to preach it as all without them, but
 to enable them, in the preaching of it, *so* to
 expresse themselves in every Nation's *proper*
 Dialect, that they to whom they spake
 might *understand* what was spoken to them,
 but as for the Ability which they had to
 preach the Gospel simply it self, *without Re-*
lation to other Nations, that, they received
immediately from the Holy Ghost, which
 was poured forth *upon* them, and dwelt *in*
 them, and by Virtue of this *indwelling* of the
 Spirit, the *most sincere* amongst them were
 able to preach the Gospel fully, and *effectually*
 to those of their own Nation (and any o-
 ther who understood their Language) with-
 out the additionall Gift of Tongues; but the
 Priest

Priest in comparing humane Learning with the Gift of Tongues, and then inferring that because the use of Tongues was needful to the Apostles, in order to preach the Gospel to all Nations, who could not otherwise have understood them, therefore humane Learning is needful (*yea absolutely necessary*) in order to preach the Gospel to them of their own Nation and Language, and who can understand us *as well* without it: In this I say, he *covertly imposeth* a Falshood upon his Reader, which he ought not to have done. He might rather have inferred thus, That if the Apostles having *received the Promise* of the Father, in the *pouring forth* of his Spirit upon them, were thereby enabled and fitted to preach the Gospel, to *their own Countrymen*, in their own *Mother-Tongue*, without the help of other Languages, then such now as have received the *same Spirit* (whether in the same measure is not material, it being sufficient if the *Measure* received be *suitable* to the present *Service*) are thereby made able to preach the Gospel in their own *Mother-Tongue*, to such as understand that Tongue, without the help of *Humane Learning*, and this sets Humane Learning *quite aside*, as to any *Necessity* of it in preaching the Gospel.

But

But he saith, *There was great Reason for choosing illiterate men then, in order to the most successful Promulgation of the Gospel, and the Glory of God; for had our Lord chosen the Philosophers and learned Rabbies of the time, his whole Doctrine might have been opposed with greater Force of Argument, and would have lost much of its Reputation, by being ascribed to such mens Invention, as if its Success had been wholly owing to their Skill and Learning, and not to the mighty Power of God.*

Answ. The Reason holds good still; Experience shews that these learned men, that call themselves Ministers of the Gospel now, do extol and cry up their humane learning beyond the Power of God; for they make that Learning such an indispensable Qualification, and of such absolute Necessity, that though a man be indued with Power from on high, though he hath received the Promise of the Father, though he be full of the Holy Ghost, and of Faith, yet if he be not skilled in humane Learning (or at least supposed to be) they say, he is not fit to preach the Gospel.

But he saith, *That was a time extraordinary, the Disciples being to plant the Gospel in all Nations, and probably understanding no Language but the Syrian, Christ therefore rains*
Q upon

upon them cloven Tongues, whereby they were capacitated to preach the Gospel to all People, and Nations under Heaven, page 100.

Answ. If that was an extraordinary time and occasion, in and upon which, Tongues were given, he is the more to blame for inferring from thence a Necessity of Humane Learning, in ordinary times, and upon ordinary occasions: He should have remembered what himself saith, page 128. *That it is a most grand Fallacy, to draw an universal Conclusion, from particular Premises.*

But a time, he saith, was coming when these Tongues should cease, the main Work being done, page 101.

Answ. 'Tis true, Tongues being given but for a particular Service were to cease, that Service being answered, but the Teaching of the Spirit was not to cease, it had no Dependency upon Tongues, and therefore was not to cease with them; it was before them, and was to continue after them. The Comforter, the Spirit of Truth (which

John 14. Christ said, he would pray the
16. and Father to send to his Disciples)
ver. 26. was to abide with them forever,
chap. 16. and he was to be their Teacher,
13. and to guide them into all Truth.

Besides

(227)
Besides the Apostle Paul, writing to the Church at Ephesus, amongst whom (being of one Tongue) there was no need of 17.

Tongues, and by whom we read of no Miracles wrought, tells them, *He ceaseth not to pray for them, that God would give them the Spirit of Wisdom, and Revelation, in the Knowledge of himself.* From whence it is evident, *First*, That divine Revelation had no Dependence upon Tongues, or Miracles. *Secondly*, That although Tongues were for a particular Service and Season, and therefore were to cease, yet that the *Ministration of the Spirit by divine Revelation, was not to cease*, but to continue in the Church of Christ, therefore also he exhorts the *Thessalonians*, not to quench the Spirit, 1 Thes. 5. 19.

But he saith, *It would be presumption in them, who pretend to be the Apostles Successors to expect to receive all Gospel Knowledge in the same manner, and in all those Ways, wherein it was communicated to the Apostles*, page 101.

Ans. How far he will strain the Word all (in the last Clause.) I know not; but if by all those Ways he intends no more than an inward Manifestation, and immediate Revela-

tion of the mind and Will of God to them, by the Spirit of Truth which dwells in them, I will adventure to tell him it is no Presumption at all in those who are the Apostles Successors, to expect to receive the Knowledge of the Gospel in the same manner; for as our Saviour prayed not for them only, but

John 17. all such also, as should believe on him through their Word. So what

20. he promised concerning sending the Comforter, to be in them, to teach them, to take of his and shew it unto them, to guide them into all Truth, and to abide with them forever; he did not promise with Restriction, and Limitation to them only, but with an extensive Relation to all that should believe on

him. This appears, First from the John 7. Words of Christ, He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath

38. said, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water: But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him should receive.

This is spoken indefinitely of all Believers, without any Restrains to Persons, time, or place; for the

ver. 37. Invitation is general, If any Man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink.

drink, &c. Secondly, It does appear that this inward, immediate and spiritual Teaching was known and received by the Saints of old in general, of whom we read not that they spake with Tongues, or wrought Miracles: The very little Children (Babes in Christ) to whom John writ, had received the Anointing. *Ye have an Unction from the holy One, and ye know all things, the Anointing which ye have received of him, abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same Anointing teacheth you of all things and is Truth, and no Lye; and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.* Hence it is manifest, that in the Primitive Church, the Saints in general had the Spirit poured on them, had the Anointing in them, that the End of it was to teach and guide them, and that they were taught and guided by it. Thirdly, Besides, this inward and immediate Teaching of the Spirit of God, by which the Knowledge of the Gospel is communicated, being the very End for which the Comforter was sent, and (as I may say) the natural Effects of his coming (implied in those Words of Christ, *He shall teach you all things, he shall testify of me*

he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you; he shall guide you into all Truth, &c.) it must either be granted that these *Effects* of his Coming are now received, and known in the true Church, or denied that the *Comforter* is now received, and doth abide with *Believers* at all. The Consequence whereof would be, that Christ hath left his People *Comfortless*, which he hath assured them he will not do; but if the *Comforter*, the Spirit of Truth be now to be expected (he is faithful that promised) if he is to be in the Saints, and to abide with them forever; if his Office be to *testifie* of Christ, to *receive* of Christ's, and *shew* it unto them, to *teach* them all things, and to *guide* them into all Truth;

John 14. 18. v. 16. 17. chap. 15. 26. chap. 16. 14. chap. 14. 26. chap. 16. 13. I hope Reader thou wilt not think it Presumption in them, that are truly the Apostles Successors in Faith and Doctrine, to expect to receive the Knowledge of the Gospel, in the same manner as they received it.

Again, he saith, it is as ungodly and absurd to depend upon extraordinary Revelations, and Miracles, while we neglect the ordinary means

under

under which we live, as it is for an Husbandman to give over his Husbandry in expectation of being provided for by daily Miracles, page 102. And a little lower, he saith, *Though God's Hand be not shortned, but that it is in his Power to give the Church now the same Gift of Tongues, of Working Miracles, and the rest as he was pleased to do in the Primitive Age of the Church, &c.*

Ans. By this he seems not rightly to understand how the Apostles and primitive Christians received the Knowledge of the Gospel; for he is still *barping* upon the Gift of Tongues and Miracles, as if he apprehended, they had received the Knowledge of the Gospel by these means, and that therefore it is *Presumption* in any now, to expect to receive the Knowledge of the Gospel in the *same manner*, as they received it; but in this he greatly errs, not distinguishing between the *Effects* and the *Cause*: Tongues and Miracles were but the *Effects* of that *divine Power*, wherewith they were *filled*, of that holy Spirit which *rested* on them, and dwelled in them. Now the Apostles did not receive the Knowledge of the Gospel by Tongues and Miracles, these were but *Mediums* to convey their Message to others, and

perswade a Belief of it, but that which they received the Knowledge of the Gospel from, was the *Divine Power it self*, the *Holy Spirit it self*, which dwelt in them, from which the Tongues and Miracles did *sometimes* flow (I say *sometimes* ; for they were not *inseparable Effects* of the Spirit ; for if they had been so, then when and wheresoever the Spirit had appeared, these Effects must *unavoidably* have followed, but that they did not ; for all

the true Believers received the Spirit, yet did not all work Miracles, nor speak with Tongues) Thus
 Rom. 8. Paul having told the Corinthians,
 9. that the God of the World hath
 1 Corin. blinded the Minds of them that be-
 12. 29. lieve not, lest the Light of the glori-
 30. ous Gospel of Christ, who is the I-
 2 Cor. mage of God, should shine unto them,
 4. 4. ver. 6. shews them how the Knowledge
 of the Gospel is to be received ;
 for God (saith he) who commanded
 the Light to shine out of Darkness,
 hath shined in our Hearts, to give
 the Light of the Knowledge of the
 Glory of God, in the Face of Jesus
 Christ. And in his Epistle to the
 Galatians, he plainly shews, that
 be

he received the Knowledge of the Gal. 1.
Gospel; and Ability to preach Christ 16.
from the Revelation of Christ in him.

Seeing then that the Apostles, and Eph. 3.
primitive Christians did receive the 3. 7.
Knowledge of the Gospel from

the immediate Teachings of the holy Spirit,
which dwelt in them, and not from Tongues
or Miracles; and seeing this holy Spirit (as I
have before proved) was promised to abide
with the Saints forever, to be their Teacher,
and Guide into all Truth, I thence infer, that
the Cessation of Tongues, and Miracles doth
not at all render it any Presumption, Ungodli-
ness or Absurdity in those, who are the Apo-
stles Successors in Faith and Doctrine, to ex-
pect to receive the Knowledge of the Gospel
now in the same manner, as it was commu-
nicated to them of old.

Yet that he may not seem wholly to ex-
clude the Spirit, he thus saith, *That the Spi-
rit helpeth us to understand old Truths, alrea-
dy revealed in Scripture, we confess and pray
for his Assistance therein, &c.* page 103.

Ans^r. Either he doth not speak sincerely,
or else he hath forgot himself, but a little be-
fore (page 92, 93, 94.) he said that, *All the
necessary Points of Religion, whatsoever is ne-
cessary*

*cessary to Salvation ; whatsoever is either to be believed or done, is in some Place or other in the holy Scriptures fitted to the most vulgar Capacity, and shallowest Understanding, that the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension is plain to be understood ; that the Duties of the first and second Table of the Law, and the Love of God and our Neighbour (which I have elsewhere shew'd) comprehends the whole Law and the Prophets) all the Evangelical Precepts, and the Essentials of Religion, are in the Gospel made such easie Doctrines, that he that runs may read them, being fitted to the Capacity of the most unlearned ; that those Passages in the Scriptures, which are of the greatest Concern, are written in such a plain and familiar Style, that the weakest and most illiterate shall never be able to excuse the neglect of them : In a Word, The great Law-giver (he saith) hath made those Doctrines most plain, which are most necessary to be believed, and those least necessary, which are most difficult. Now if he did believe himself when he said all this, I wonder what he expects his Reader should believe of him, when (in behalf of himself and all his Brethren) he here saith (page 103.) we confess the Spirit helpeth us to understand old
*T ruths**

Truths already revealed in the Scriptures, and we pray for his Assistance therein. Do they pray for the Assistance of the Spirit to help them understand those things which he saith, are already fitted to the Capacity of the weakest, most illiterate and unlearned, which are suited to the shallowest Understanding, nay, which are made so plain and easie, that he that runs may read them? What else were this, but to mock the holy Ghost by invoking his Assistance to help them understand that, which they confess they understand already; and which they affirm to be so plain and easie, that the weakest, the shallowest, the most unlearned may understand! And yet of this kind do they reckon all necessary Points in Religion; all the Duties of the first and second Table of the Law, the Love of God and our Neighbour, the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension; all the Commands of the Gospel, all the Essentials of Religion, and in short, whatsoever is either to be believed or done, necessary to Salvation; but what then hath he left for himself and his Brethren to pray for the Assistance of the Spirit to help them to understand? Nothing that is necessary to Salvation to be sure, no Essential of Religion, no
Gospel

Gospel Precept, no Part of the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension; none of the Duties of the first or second Table; nothing of the Love of God or our Neighbour; what can it be then? Some difficult Passages, which himself confesseth are least necessary to be believed (as the Circumstances of the Levitical Rites, the Genealogies in Scripture, and Apocalyptical Prophecies (these are his own Instances, page 93.) say, in order to Salvation, not at all necessary either to be believed or done. See now what his fair Flourish of Praying for the Spirit is come to.

Besides, to say they are already revealed in Scripture, and yet say he wants the Assistance of the Spirit to help him understand them, is a Contradiction; for what he doth not understand is not already revealed, but veiled to him; if he already understand it, he in vain implores Assistance to help him to understand it; if he doth not already understand it, then it is not yet revealed to him, but hid or covered from him, & in praying for the Assistance of the Spirit to understand it, he acknowledgeth the Necessity of the Spirit's Teaching, and confesseth that Revelation is to be expected in this Age.

But

But (saith he) to pretend to such *Miraculous Inspirations as the Apostles once had, or to new Revelations beyond what was discovered to them, is an horrible Cheat, &c.*

Ans^w That the Inspirations which the Apostles had, or the Teaching of the Spirit, whereby the mind of God was communicated to them, had *no Dependency upon Miracles*, I have shewed before: As for *New Revelations*, it is a Phrase of his own, not used by us, and if by New, he intend New as to *Substance*, he doth not rightly represent us; for we do not expect a Revelation of *any other Gospel, of any other Way of Salvation, of any other Essentials* in the Christian Religion, then what were revealed to the primitive Christians, and have been in all Ages revealed to the *Saints in some Degree* or other, and which by the divinely inspired Penmen were committed to writing, and are declared of in the holy Scriptures; but as no *Prophecy of old time came by the will of*

man, but holy men of God spake 2 Pet. 1, 21.

as they were moved by the holy

Ghost, so neither can the true Sense and Meaning of those heavenly Doctrines contained in the holy Scriptures, be comprehended or understood by the Wit and Wisdom

of

of man (in his highest *Natural Attainments*)
 but only & alone by the *Openings* and *Disco-*
veries of that holy Spirit, by which they were
 at first *revealed*. Those divine *Mysteries* are
Mysteries indeed, and remain so, as a sealed
 Book (which neither the *unlearned*, nor yet the
most learned in the wisdom of this

Isa. 29. World is able by that *Learning* to
 open) until Christ (the Lamb) doth

Rev. 5. open them : And these Heavenly
 things and divine *Mysteries* so

chap. 3. 7. opened by him, who hath the Key
 of David (wherewith he openeth,

and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man
 with all his humane *Learning* openeth) are not
New Revelations, that is *New things* *revea-*
led, but rather *renewed Revelations*, that is,
Old things *revealed anew* : The same Gospel
 the same Way of Salvation, the same *Essen-*
tials of Religion, the same *Principles* and
Doctrine, in a word, the same Good Old
 Truths, which were revealed to the Saints
 of old, and are recorded in the holy *Scrip-*
tures, *revealed now anew*. And this *Reve-*
lation is *absolutely necessary* : for without it
 there is no true, no certain, no living *Know-*
ledge of God the Father, or of Jesus Christ
 his Son. This our Saviour told the *Jews*,
 No

No man (sayes he) knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Mat. 11. 27.

Son will reveal him. Humane Learning cannot do it. Nor can the Doctrines of the Gospel, or the Myſteries of God's Kingdom, be known to man, but by the Revelation of the Holy Spirit (Humane Learning cannot discover them) for, *The things of God (saith Paul) knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.* 1 Cor. 2. 11.

Perhaps the Priest will say, *They are revealed in the Scriptures.* But I shall then tell him, That Revelation is necessary (yea, of Necessity) even to understand the Scriptures. For he himself observes (p. 96.) that *it is not the Letter, but the Sense that is the Word of God.* If so, it is not enough for any man to have and read the Letter only (though he spend his Age therein) but if he expect profit thereby, he must come to the true Sense, which (how learned soever he be in the Wisdom of this World) *he never can attain unto, until the holy Spirit reveal it to him.* And to this purpose must his own words serve (if they will serve to any purpose at all) namely,

namely, *We confess that the Spirit helpeth us to understand old Truths already revealed in Scripture, and we pray for his Assistance therein*, pag. 103. In which words (though he mistakes, in saying they are revealed already to him, that doth not understand them. yet) by confessing that *the Spirit doth help to understand*, and praying for his Assistance therein, he acknowledges that the Truths contained in the Scriptures are to be revealed by *the Spirit*.

Having premised this, I hold my self the less concern'd to take notice of what he sayes concerned *new Revelations*; because he speaks upon a false Ground, and shoots at random: Yet some things scattered here and there in his Discourie I may speak briefly to, to make him more sensible of his Mistakes.

1st. He says, *These New Revelations highly disparage the Scriptures*.

Answ. He that desires and waits to have the Truth's Record in the Scriptures, revealed to him by the same Spirit from which they were written, doth not at all disparage the Scriptures, but honours them.

But he sayes, *The Scripture, if it be true and may be believed, declares it self to be a perfect*

perfect and sufficient Rule in order to Salvation, 2 Tim. 3. 17.

Ans. The Scripture (so far as it hath escaped Corruption from Mis-transcribing, Mis-translating, Mis-printing, and the like) is true, and not only may but ought to be believed. But I do not find it declares that of it self, which he hath here declared of it, from 2 Tim. 3. 17. namely, that it is a *perfect and sufficient Rule in order to Salvation*. That place sayes thus, Vers. 16. (for the 17th Verse depends on that, and is imperfect without it) *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness; Vers. 17. That the Man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all Good Works.* Now (to let pass the Translation, which is not altogether so well as it might be) here is *no mention of a Rule at all*. The Scripture is here said to be *profitable*, but I hope the Priest will not say, every thing that is *profitable* is a *perfect and sufficient Rule*. He sayes humane Learning is *profitable*, and not only so, but *necessary*, yea of *Necessury* to the Understanding & Preaching the Gospel; will he therefore make humane Learning the *Rule*? But how regardless is this man of speaking

R

king

king Truth, who so confidently sayes, *the Scripture declares it self to be a perfect and sufficient Rule in order to Salvation*; whenas that Scripture which he brings to prove this, hath no such words in it.

But he adds, *That the Scripture accufes all that shall preach any other Doctrine*, Gal. 1.8,9.

Anfw. If he means any other Doctrine then this, which he has preached, concerning the Scripture being a perfect and sufficient Rule, he *errs and wrongs the Text*. For the Apostle there sayes, *If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, then that we have preached, and you have received, let him be accursed.* And so say I: He that preaches any other Gospel, then what was then preached by the Apostle, the Curse and Wo is to him. But let me withal tell my Adversary, he did *unadvisedly* to bring these two Scriptures together: For in that to Timothy, the Apostle saith, *That the Man of God may be perfect*; but that the Priest denies it is possible for him to be. So that he preaches not only another, but a *directly contrary* Doctrine to what the Apostle preacht. Let him look again then, and consider, whether he has not brought the Curse to *his own Door*.

Again, he sayes, pag. 104. *Consider how contrary*

contrary these new Revelations are to God's constant Method, in regard they come naked without any Miracles to attest them ; for when did God ever send any new Doctrine, and did not also give the Preachers thereof a Power of Working Miracles. &c ?

Ans. This all depends upon the word *New* (New Revelations and New Doctrines) which I have before shewed to be a Mistake, and that we are not concerned therein ; if by New Doctrines he means such Doctrines as are essential to Salvation, we do not pretend or expect to have any New Gospel, or such New Doctrines revealed to us : but we say, the Good Old Gospel, and the Doctrines of it (which were of old revealed to the Apostles and Saints in the first Ages of Christianity, and which are declared of in the Scriptures of Truth) are now (after the long Night of thick Darkness, which hath covered the Earth, and that general Apostacy, wherein *all the World* wondred after and worshipped the Beast, and the Inhabitants of the Earth were made drunk with the Wine of the Fornication of the great Whore, of which all Nations had drunk) again revealed by

Rev. 13.

3, 4.

Chap. 17.

2.

Chap. 18.

3.

the same Spirit, which Christ promised to send to his Disciples, *to be in them, to teach them all things, to guide them into all Truth, to take of his and shew it unto them, and to abide with them forever*; the

Ephes. 3.

10.

1 Cor. 2.

9, 10.

Rev. 10

4.

in his manifold Discoveries and Revelations beyond Utterance; the highest Degree whereof is in no wise repugnant to those Essential Truths declared of in Scripture. And it is observable, that although the Gospel was

preached in *Demonstration* and *Power*, by the Apostles and Disciples, in the Beginning,

and that too universally, yet *John*

in his Vision of the future State of the Church, saw the Gospel preacht again by an *Angel*, *flying in the midst of Heaven*; thereby intimating, that the Gospel should be preached in the *Demonstration of the Spirit and Power*, after the apostacy, as well as it had been before. Yet we read not of any Miracles he wrought, though he was an Angel.

Yet in the next page, he has another fling at *New Revelations*, which, he says, *manifestly contradict the Faith of the primitive Christians.*

Ans.

Answ. To this I shall not need to say much: Let them look to it whom it concerns. That it concerns not us, I have already shewed. The Faith which we have received is *the same* with that of the primitive *Christians*, the Author of it is *the same*, the Finisher of it *the same*, and we have received it after *the same* manner that they received it of old, namely, *by the Gift of God*. But *other* Gospel then that which they had, we do not expect.

Again, in pag. 106, 107. Upon his old Text of new Revelations, he runs into an Extravagant Vein of Rayllery, charging us with *Falshood, Rayling, Nonsense and Blasphemy*, that we would bring the World into Egyptian Darknes, and all this (and much more) for a Dream, a meer Fancy, a Miserable Mistake, &c. that we follow a False and Fantastick Light, and adore a Lye for divine Revelation, &c.

Answ. In this Case, what fitter Answer can be given, then that which Michael gave the Devil, *The Jude 9.* Lord Rebuke thee. Unhappy Man! whom nothing less would satisfie, then to dash himself against that Stone, which if

it fall upon him, will *dash him to pieces*. Was it not enough, that he hath *reviled* and *vili-fied* us throughout his whole Book, but he must also *blaspheme* the *Light* of the Son of God, and the *Operation* of the *Holy Ghost*, in calling the one a *False & Fantastick Light*, and the other a *Lye*! Well, let him remem-

ber that the Apostle hath said,
1 Theſſal. He that despiseth, despiseth not
 4. 8. *Man, but God, who hath also*
given unto us his good Spirit:

And let him beware of persisting in this Course, lest he bring on himself an *irreversible* Doom, which he may read, *Mat. 12. 31, 32.*

Yet would not this man for all this, be thought to deny all Revelation neither. For sayes he, *I own those Revelations which are upon Record in the holy Bible, which is the Word of God, wherein he hath revealed his Will to the Church, &c. pag. 107.*

Anſw. He seems not rightly to understand Revelation but rather to have taken in some strange Notion concerning it. I would gladly know of him, how he would be understood when he sayes, *God has revealed his Will to the Church in the Holy Bible.* He sayes,

sayes, *The Letter is not the Word, but the Sense* (pag. 96.) Does he mean then, that this Sense is so revealed in the Bible, that he that reads the Letter (though he hath no Assistance therein, but only his own natural Understanding) shall be sure to find the *true Sense*, and understand the Will of God? This his words import. Yet this he cannot reasonably intend (if he will consist with himself) because he else-where, not only urges the *Necessity of Humane Learning*, but also confesses, *the Spirit doth help them to understand the Scriptures*, and that *they therefore pray for his Assistance therein* (pag. 103.) But if he means, that the Will of God is so revealed in the Scriptures, that they can understand it *with the Help and Assistance of the Spirit*, but *not without* (which is the fair import of confessing the Spirit doth help, and praying for its Assistance therein) what else then, I pray, is this, but to say, *They can understand the Will of God in the Scriptures, when the Spirit revealeth it unto them, but not otherwise.* For if they could understand the Will of God *without the Help of the Spirit*, in vain do they invoke his Assistance: but if they *cannot* understand the Will of God in the Scriptures, *without the*

Help of the Spirit, and therefore implore his Assistance, that shews the *Necessity of the Spirit's Teaching*: and if the Spirit vouchsafe his Help, and do open and make known the Will of God to them, that is, *Revelation*. How egregiously absurd then it is, for this man to exclaim (as he does) against *Revelation*, who, upon his own Principle, cannot understand the Will of God without it, let the Reader judge.

But he charges the *Quakers* with saying, *The Bible is a Dead Letter, but the Word of God is Quick and Powerful, so is not the Bible*, p. 107.

Ans. The Word *Bible* signifies a Book, and the Book or Bible the Priests call the Word of God. This Man called it so but just now (*I own*, said he, *those Revelations which are upon Record in the Holy Bible, which is the Word of God*, pag. 107.) Hereupon, to shew them how grossly they mistake; they have been sometimes asked, *How it can be, that the Bible should be the Word of God, seeing the Word of God is quick and powerful, and the Bible (or Book) a Dead Letter?* Some of them, being by this a little awakened, to avoid the Absurdity tell us, They do not mean that the Letter is the Word of God, but the

the Sense; so says this man, p. 96. But why then do they *mean one thing*, and *speak another*? But if the *Letter* be not the *Word* of God, how can the *Bible* be the *Word* of God, seeing the *Bible* is only the *Book* wherein the *Letter* is written? Yet does this man so confound and jumble them together, that it is hard to know what at last he intends to be the *Word* of God. One while he says, *it is not the Letter, but the Sense, that is the Word of God*; by and by he says, *The Bible is the Word of God*, as if he took the *Bible*, in which the *Letter* is written, to be the *Sense* of the *Letter*: for he makes the *Bible* and the *Sense* of the *Letter* to be one and the same thing, namely, the *Word* of God: But the *Word* of God which is quick and powerful, he appears to be a Stranger to.

But he asks, *Whence we know that the Word of God is Quick and Lively?*

Ans. By *Experience*; For though he, being with the *Jews* in the *Unbelief*, has never peradventure heard the *Voice* of God at any time; yet, blessed be the Lord, we have; and when the Lord hath spoken in us, we have felt his *Word* living and powerful, discerning and discovering the *Most Secret Thoughts*

Thoughts and Intents of our Hearts. But this Answer I conclude will not answer his End: He has fitted an Answer to his own Design, and put it into his Parishioner's Mouth, to speak as for us, which is, *That We learn out of the Bible, that the Word of God is Quick and Lively.* Whereupon, as apprehending some Advantage, he layes about him with all his Might: *What!* sayes he, *Out of that Bible which they call a Dead Letter?* and so goes on for three or four pages together, in such an *insulting* strain, as if he had gotten some petty Conquest, and were now riding in Triumph. But a Wise Man would have defer'd his Boasting, until he had put his Armour off.

That the Bible, *barely as it is a Book*, is a Dead Thing; that the Scriptures, *barely as Writings*, are Dead Letters, none I think (that considers what he sayes, and dares put his Name to it) will deny. But sayes he, *Though the Leaves and Letters have no Natural Life in them, is therefore the Sense of the Scriptures dead?* No, say I; The true Sense and Meaning of the Scriptures is not dead. But that Sense which man, by his Natural Understanding and Humane Learning only, doth invent and form to himself, as if he had it
from

from the Scriptures is dead, for the true Sense and Meaning of the Scripture is received and understood *in & by the Openings and Revelation of the Divine Spirit*, and not otherwise. Now we never call the Scriptures a dead Letter in *disrespect* to or *dis-esteem* of the Scriptures but to manifest the *Mistake and Error* of those, who think it sufficient that they have the Scriptures, although *they deny the Revelation of the Spirit*, by which alone the true Sense and Meaning of the Scriptures can be understood. And though the Scriptures *without the Spirit* be a Dead Letter; yet being opened, explained, applyed, and the true Sense of them given *by the Spirit*, they are then truly serviceable, and profitable for Doctrine, for Re- 2 Tim. 3. proof, for Correction, for Instru- 16. ction in Righteousness, and may be so used by them that are led and guided by the Spirit, without any of those *Absurdities*, which this man *irreligiously* would fasten on them. Besides, when the Bible is called a Dead Letter, it is (*as in his Book*) in Opposition to them that call it the *Word of God*, as this Man expressly doth (in the very same page 107) though (to his own Contradiction) he had said but a few Leaves before

fore (pag. 96.) *It is not the Letter, but the Sense, that is the Word of God.* So that, although he will not have the *Letter* to be the *Word of God*, but the *Sense*, yet, by an incomparable Piece of Ignorance and Self-contradiction, he will have the *Bible* (or *Book*) to be the *Word of God*, as if the *Book* wherein the *Letter* is written, were the *Sense* of the *Letter*. Thus all his great Bluster and Vapour against others, ends in the *Destruction* of his own *Confusion*.

He says, pag. 112. *To look for more Revelations, or a Repetition of the former, would be equally an Act of Impudence and Infidelity.* Why of Impudence and Infidelity? He replies, *Would it not be an Act of Infidelity not to believe God, when he plainly tells us, that the Scriptures themselves are able to make us wise unto Salvation through Faith, &c. and to furnish us thoroughly to all good Works?*

Ans. He corrupts the Scripture, Where doth God plainly tell him, that the Scriptures themselves are able, &c? This word [*themselves*] he puts in of his own Head, and yet says, *God tells us plainly, that the Scriptures themselves are able, &c.* wherein he speaks Untruth of God. If this be not *Infidelity*, yet it looks as like *Impudence* as I have seen.

If the Scriptures *themselves* were able to make wise unto Salvation through Faith, &c. there were then *no Need of the Help of the Spirit*. But I have already shewed, that unless the Spirit reveal and open them, the Scriptures themselves cannot be rightly understood. And he himself, in saying, *The Spirit doth help them to understand them*, and that *they pray for its Assistance therein* (pag. 103.) doth implicitly acknowledge as much. But if there be a *Necessity of the Spirit's Teaching*, in order to a right understanding of the Scriptures, then it is evident that the Scriptures *themselves* are not able to make wise, &c. *without the Help and Assistance* (i. e. the Teaching and Revelation) of the Spirit. Whether then it can be an *Act of Infidelity* to expect that, which there is so great a *Necessity of*, that men cannot be wise unto Salvation *without it*, I leave to the Reader's Judgment. Nay, let it be well considered, seeing Christ hath plainly and expressly told us, That *he will send the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, to his Disciples; that this Spirit shall be in them, and shall abide with them forever; that he shall testify of Christ; that he shall take of Christ's, and shew it unto them; that he shall teach them all things,*

things; and guide them into all Truth (as appears in the 14, 15 & 16. Chapters of John; I say, let it be well considered) whether it is not an *Act of Infidelity* in any, who profess themselves to be Christ's Disciples, *not to believe and expect the Performance of this so absolute a Promise.* Thus far as to the Infidelity of expecting to have the Truths formerly revealed to the Saints, revealed now to us *by the same Spirit*, by which they were then revealed unto them (which I take to be the Meaning of that Phrase of his, *a Repetition of the former Revelations*) Now to the Act of Impudence; for he sayes, *To look for a Repetition of the former Revelations, would be equally an Act of Impudence and Infidelity.* And is it not an Act of Impudence (sayes he) when God has plainly told us, *that we have sufficient*, not to be contented with them (to wit, the Scriptures) but to expect and call for more?

Ans. Here again he lets his Pen run too fast, without due Consideration. I read indeed in the Holy Scriptures, that God hath said, *My Grace is sufficient*; but I never read that God said, *The Scriptures are sufficient.* Yet this man confidently sayes, *God has plainly told us.* He should have done well

well to have shewed us, where God hath plainly told this ; and indeed, it behoves him yet to produce the place, if he can ; otherwise, it will appear an *Act of great Impudence in him*, to say God hath plainly told that, which he hath not told at all. That the Scriptures *themselves* (as he speaks) are sufficient, *without* the Teaching and Revelation of the Spirit, I have before disproved. That the Help and Assistance of the Spirit is needful to understand the Scriptures, he has before granted. The Spirit's helping to understand the Scriptures is by its Teaching the true Sense and Meaning of them, by opening, discovering and making known the Mind and Will of God therein exprest. This is Revelation : for whatsoever is discovered or made known is revealed. Now then, if the Spirit doth open, discover & make known the Mind and Will of God, then the Spirit doth reveal the Mind and Will of God. And if the Mind and Will of God (although exprest in the Holy Scriptures) cannot be truly understood or known, unless the Spirit open, discover and make it known, then it follows, that the Mind and Will of God (although there exprest) cannot be truly understood
or

or known, *unless the Spirit reveal it.* So that still here is a *Necessity of Revelation.* And these very same things having been before revealed unto others, is not this a *Repetition of the former Revelation* (that is, a *Revealing of the same things to us now, that were formerly revealed to others?*) And will he, upon second Thoughts, call it an *Act of Impudence* to expect this? If he shall, I am sure that will be an *Act of most audacious Ignorance.*

In the next place, he takes upon him to give the True Sense of Christ's Words in *Mark 13. 11.* Take no Thought before hand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that Hour, that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. Which words (he sayes) import no more then this, that whereas the Disciples were to be brought before the Kings and Potentates of the Earth, to vindicate the Doctrine of Christianity, that they might be under no Discouragements, either from the Presence of those before whom they were to appear, or from a Sense of the Meanness of their own Education, he promised to supply all their Defects miraculously:
and

and whereas they had extraordinary Work to perform, they might be assured of an extraordinary Assistance from him : but this (he sayes) reacheth not to an Ordinary Case, pag. 113.

Ans. That the Words do indeed import that the Disciples, when brought before Kings and Potentates to vindicate the Doctrine of Christianity, should without *intermediation*, or taking Thought, having given to them what to speak, is evident ; but with what colour of Reason he will *restrain* this to that Age only, so as to make it an *Extraordinary Case*, I see not. Was any thing more ordinary in the succeeding Ages, under the Heathenish Roman Emperors, then for the Disciples of Christ to be brought before Kings and Potentates to vindicate the Doctrine of Christianity ? Were not these (for the most part) under *equal* Discouragements (either for the Presence of those before whom they were to appear, or from a Sense of the *Meanness* of their own Education) with the former ? and had they not need of *equal* Supply ? Nay, hath it not been the *ordinary* Case of Christ's Disciples in all Ages to be brought before Rulers and Magistrates, to

vindicate the Doctrine of Christianity (why then doth he call theirs of old an *extraordinary* Case ?) and have they not (for the general) been of *mean* Education, (and from thence under the same *Discouragements* with the former) why then would he abridge them of the *same Assistance* ? Besides, observe the Reason which Christ gives, why his Disciples should not take Thought, nor premeditate or study what to speak ; *For* (saith Christ) *it is not ye that speak, but the holy Ghost*. But if the priest will *restrain* this Promise to them of *that Age only*, what will he thereby seem to say to the Disciples of *this Age* in the like Cases, but this, *When ye are brought before Rulers and Magistrates to vindicate the Doctrine of Christianity, do not ye have your Eye to God, in expectation that he should give you any thing to speak, but bethink your selves before hand, and go provided with your Answer; for it is not now the Holy Ghost that speaks, but it is ye*. But consider Reader, how unsuitable this would be to that Promise of

Christ, of *sending the Comforter to be in his Disciples, and to abide with them forever*. Our Saviour Christ, when he was ready to ascend

John 14.
16, 17.

ascend unto his Father, made this solemn Promise to his Apostles, *Mat. 28. Lo, I am with you always, even unto the End of the World.* This cannot be restrained to them only, to whom it was spoken; for then it had extended to none but the eleven Apostles, by which means the seventy Disciples had been excluded, besides the Priests use to tell us, that this Promise of Christ did not relate to the Apostles and Disciples of that Age only, but is extensive to the Ministers of Christ in all Ages to the World's End. Now that Christ was with his Apostles and Disciples in that Age by his Spirit, by which he gave them in the very hour that which they should speak (so that it was not properly they, but the Holy Ghost in them, that spoke) and by which he revealed the Gospel, and Heavenly Mysteries of God's Kingdom to them, enabling them thereby to preach them powerfully and effectually to others, in the Demonstration of the Spirit, this is on all Hands confessed; but what Reason then can there be, that any should put in for a Share in this Promise of Christ's Presence, and yet deny, and his refuse to enjoy his Presence in that manner, which

S 2

them.

themselves confess, they to whom the Promise was directly and immediately made, did enjoy it in?

But he takes notice of *some Speakers* that said, they did not know before they began what they had to say, but as the Spirit gave them Utterance that only would they speak, and although they came without Preparation, yet speak notably. This he rails extremely against and calls it the *Sacrifice of a Fool*.

Ans. Had he forgot that so to speak was the Apostles Practice, or did he design to call them Fools by Craft (as the Proverb is) for certain it is that the Apostles spoke as the Spirit gave them Utterance, yet this way Acts 2.4. of speaking he prophane-ly calls the *Sacrifice of a Fool*. If he had disliked it, yet he might, one would think, have spoken less uncivilly of it; had it been but for their sake, whom he could not but know to have used it; but at this time it seems his *ill will* to us got the upper Hand of his Respect to them. But consider, Reader, doth this Practice deserve so foul a Reflection as he hath bestowed upon it? Solomon when he spake of the sacrifice of a Fool, said, *Be not rash with thy Mouth, and let not thy Heart be*

be *hasty to utter anything before God*; for *God is in Heaven, and* Eccl. 5. *thou upon Earth, therefore let thy* 2. *Words be few.* Judge now whether is more like the Fool in his Sacrifice, he that waits upon the Lord, to receive from him what he shall speak, and speaketh only what he doth receive from him, and that according as the Holy Spirit gives him Utterance, and no further, nor otherwise; or he who is so *rash with his Mouth*, and whose Heart is so *hasty to utter*, that he is scarce well settled in his Seat, ere his Tongue begins to run, whose Tongue is *unbridled*, at his own Command, and he can begin when he will, and end when he will, say as much as he will, as little as he will, and what he will, so that all is in his own Power.

Yet from these Words of Solomon, he saith we may take notice, that the Spirit of God is so far from owning these Extemporary Exercises in his Worship, that they are reproved by him, page 114.

Ans. If he insists on the Word those, thereby meaning *Rash, Hasty and Foolish Exercises*, he had as good have said nothing, that being *nothing to the Purpose*; but if he intends that all extemporary Exercises are so

Far from being owned by the Spirit of God in his Worship, that they are reproved by him, I tell him he *errs*, and runs *unavoidably* upon one of these *Absurdities*, either that the *Apostles* did not speak by the *immediate Inspiration of the holy Spirit*, extemporarily and without *Premeditation*, or that if they did so speak, yet *God* did not own it in his *Worship*, but reproved it: Either of which I think he will be more considerate then in cool Blood to assert.

He goes on thus, page 115. 'Tis not the *Swiftness of the Fancy, Quickness of Invention, Readiness of Elucution, Fluency of Speech, or a ready Tongue*, that *God* is delighted with; with these we work upon the *Imperfections of Men*, and these are natural *Faculties*, with which the worst of *Men* have been endowed, such as *Achitophel* and *Tertullus*, whilst holy *Moses* was naturally defective in his *Utterance*.

Ans. He said right indeed, *With these* we work upon the *Imperfections of Men*; for these are the chief *Tools* he works with, and *Mens Imperfections* the matter he works upon; but he might if he pleased have put *humane Learning* in among his natural *Faculties*; for *God* is no more delighted with that in his *Worship*, then with the other, and that is but

but a *Natural Attainment*; which the words of *Men* have acquired, as well as the other, even such as *Achitophel* and *Tertullus*, all which notwithstanding renders neither the one nor the other evil, or unserviceable in their proper Places, but blames the Abuse, and Mis-application of them.

But he saith, *We must not overthrow that plain Advice which St. Paul gives to Timothy, Till I come give Attendance to Reading, Exhortation and Doctrine: Meditate on these things, give thy self wholly unto them, that thy profiting may appear unto all, 1 Tim. 4. 13, 15.*

Ans. When he called this *plain Advice*, methinks the very Word [*Plain*] might have put him in mind to have dealt *plainly*; He gives us here the 13th. and 15th. verses, but what made him leap over the 14th. was he afraid of it? what's the matter? is there any thing in it that he thought would be too hard for him? Let us hear what it saith, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, ver. 14.* No wonder that he shunned this Verse; for here's the *Gift of God* mentioned, which *Timothy* had in him, and which was given him by *Pro-*

phesy, &c. And he was as plainly advised to meditate on this, and give himself as fully to this as to any of the rest, not to say something more also, in as much as his Profitting in the rest had no small Dependence on his diligent Attendance to this. We see now the Reason why this was stept over.

He saith (page 116) *We have great Reason to be truly thankful that the Scriptures are translated into the vulgar Languages, but then we are beholden to the Learning of the Translators.*

Ans. We are indeed very sensible of the Goodness, and Love of the Lord to us, in that he hath been pleased so to order it, that we can read the holy Scriptures in our own mother Tongue, and we are truly thankful unto him for it. Nor would I detract a Tittle from the due Praise of the Translators, or in the least undervalue or disesteem that Learning which they made use of in their Work, which I always acknowledge to be good & serviceable in its right place, as an outward Means (as Writing also and Printing have been) to bring the Scriptures into that Language, which I most readily understand, and herein I acknowledge I receive a Benefit by Learning, and am thus far beholden thereunto (and so

I am to *Printing* also, and to *Writing* much more; for without the first of these the *Scriptures* could not have been *so common & easie to come by*, but without the latter, *they could not have been at all*) but this is still but the *outward Part*, and as it were the *Bark, Rind or Shell*; the *Sap*, the *Substance*, the *Kernel lies within*, and is *beyond the Reach of humane Learning*; that the *divine Spirit* is alone able to give, but to *set up humane Learning in the Room* (as it were) of the *Spirit*, and attribute that to humane Learning which properly belongs to the *Spirit*, namely to *disclose and reveal the Mind of God*, this is not *true Honour*, but an *Abuse to Learning*.

But he saith, *If Learning were at first necessary for the translating of the Scriptures, it is still as necessary for the Interpreting of them.*

Ans. If by interpreting he means (according to the common Acceptation of the Word) an *Opening*, and giving the *Sense and Meaning* of the *Scriptures*, I deny his Consequence; for though Learning was at first necessary to turn the Words out of one Language into another, yet it is not necessary to give the *Sense*, and open the meaning of the matter contained in the Words, because it
neither

neither was designed thereto, nor is capable thereof; for as in Natural things, what man (saith the Apostle) knoweth the things of a Man save the Spirit of Man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth

1 Cor. 2. no man, but the Spirit of God.

11, 12. Now we (saith he) have received not the Spirit of the World, but the

Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. The Apostle here layes the Capacity of knowing the things that are given us of God upon our receiving the Spirit of God, and wholly shuts out the Spirit of the World from having any thing to do in it, and that not without great Reason; for he that hath most of the Spirit of the World, he who is deepest in the Wisdom and Understanding of the World, and who hath climbed to the highest Pitch of humane Learning, is by all these Attainments but a Natural Man. And the Apostle saith expressly (ver. 14.) The Natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are Foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. Where then is the Necessity of humane Learning to interpret the Scriptures.

But he intimates, That there is still a Necessity

cessity of understanding those Tongues for the Translation of Scripture.

Answ. Not if the Scriptures be already rightly translated; but by this he implies, that the *present Translation is not true*: And what a Condition doth he leave them in then, to whom he proposes it as a *perfect and sufficient Rule*; for if the Scripture (*not the Spirit*) is to be their Rule, then to them that understand it not in other Languages (which not one of an hundred doth) the *Translation of the Scripture must be the Rule*, and if that Translation be *not true*, the Rule is *not true* (and what will the Consequence of that be) but if the Translation be true, then there is not a *Necessity* still of understanding those Tongues for the Translation of Scripture.

But saith he, *I pray by what way and means must we attain the Knowledge of it* (speaking of the Scripture just before) *but by the ordinary means of Study, Industry, or University-Education?*

Answ. The Question implies he knows *no other Way*, and indeed I doubt he doth not; yet if he thinks there is *no other Way*, I would ask him why he saith (page 103.) *He prays for the Assistance of the Spirit to help him understand the Scriptures?* Is not that *another*

ther Way then by Study, Industry, or University Education.

He next attempts to shew the use of Learning, in unfolding difficult places in Scripture, namely, for the Understanding the Literal, Moral, Mystical, Tropical, Metaphorical, Allegorical, Hyperbolical Senses, which he confesseth are hard Words, and hard indeed would the Case of Mankind be, if the Gospel could not be understood, and preached unto them without understanding these hard words, but the best on it is, these hard words relate but to the difficult Places, which (he saith, page 93.) are least necessary, nay not at all necessary to Salvation: All Points whatsoever necessary to Salvation, either to be believed or done; the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension; the Duties of the first and second Table; the Love of God and our Neighbour, all Evangelical Precepts, and the Essentials of Religion, being fitted to the most vulgar Capacity, and shallowest Understanding, suited to the Capacity of the weakest and most unlearned, written in such a plain and familiar Style, and made such easie Doctrines, that he that runs may read them, So then here is no need of a learned Priest, to puzzle Peoples Heads with hard Words,
and

and pick their Pockets by Tropes and Hyperbolies ; for the Gospel with all the Doctrines and Precepts of it, the Essentials of Religion, and whatsoever is necessary to Salvation, being so plain and easie to be understood, may very well be preach't without Study, or humane Learning, by such as, having freely received, are willing freely to give.

But he chargeth the Quakers with mistiming and abusing the Prophecy of Joel, in applying it to this present Age. The words are, *And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all Flesh, &c.* chap. 2. 28. This Prophecy he tells us, a learned Commentator tells him, was cited and applied by St. Peter (Acts 2.) to the times of the Gospel.

Answer. What doth he mean by the times of the Gospel ? are not these times, which we live in, the times of the Gospel ? what times I wonder doth he take these to be ?

But Peter explains the Word [*afterward*] by the last days ; for whereas the Prophet had said, *It shall come to pass afterward, &c.* The Apostle saith, *It shall come to pass in the last Days, &c.* Upon this the Priest recites these Words of his learned Commentator, *Whatsoever can be collected from this Place to*
the

the Benefits of the Presenders, will receive a short and clear Answer, by considering the time to which this Prediction (and the Completion of it) belonged, and that is expressly the last Days, in the Notion wherein the Writers of the new Testament constantly use that Phrase not for these Days of ours so far advanced toward the End of the World, but for the time immediately preceding the Destruction of the Jewish Policy, &c. page 123.

Ans. That this Prophecy then relates to the last Days (whensoever they fall to be) both he and his Commentator grant us, but we do not agree which are the last Days. He saith, these days of ours are not the last Days, but those Days immediately foregoing the Destruction of Jerusalem. That the last Days did then begin, I grant, but that they are already ended, I deny. Will he call them the last Days, and yet say these, which are sixteen hundred Years later then they are not the last Days? What can he say more repugnant to Reason? Which is more properly the last, the foremost, or the hindermost, that that is gone before, or that that followeth after? But I observe he saith, The last Days are not these of ours, so far advanced towards the End of the World, &c. as if he thought the advance-
ment

ment of these Days so far towards the End of the World a fit Medium to prove them not the last Days, then which I think he could not have found an unsitter. since by how much the further they are advanced towards the End of the World, by so much the more properly they may be called the last Days.

But he would have it, That the Writers of the New Testament do constantly use that Phrase [the last Days] with relation to that time immediatly preceding the Destruction of Jerusalem.

Ans. No they do not constantly use that Phrase with relation to that time; the Apostle Paul to Timothy saith, *In the last days* perivous times shall come: Peter also 2 Tim. 3. saith, *There shall come in the last* 1. *days Scoffers.* This must not be understood of that time only where- 2 Pet. 3. 3. in they lived, because they both speak in the future Tense (shall of a time hereafter, or then to come; & saith the Apostle James to the rich men, *Your Gold and Silver is cankered, and the Rust of* Jam. 5. 3. *them shall be a Witness against you,* and shall eat your Flesh, as Fire; ye have heaped Treasure together for the last Days. In which Places the last Days cannot reasonably be

be understood of the time of *Jerusalem's* Destruction.

But to shorten the Work, I will grant him that *the Last Dayes did then begin*, to which that Prophecy had relation: let him prove that the Last Dayes are *at an end*, or that the Spirit was to be poured out in *some part only* of the Last Dayes, and not in all. if he will have the pouring forth of the Spirit to be now ceased. Our Saviour, when he promised to send the Comforter, told

John 14. his Disciples, *He should abide with*
16. *them forever.* And at that very
Mat. 28. time, when he commanded his
20. Disciples to wait at *Jerusalem* to receive the pouring forth of the Spirit, *he promised to be with them alwayes, even unto the End of the World.*

I have now done with his Discourse upon this Subject, namely, of *Humane Learning* and *Divine Revelation*.

I will add a Testimony or two of other men, of sufficient Note and Credit, to shew we stand not alone in this matter, and leave the whole to the impartial Reader's Judgment.

The first shall be of *W. Tindall*, a faithful Martyr,

Martyr, who thus writes; 'It is
 'impossible to understand in the
 'Scriptures more then a *Turk*,
 'for whosoever hath not the Law
 'of God written in his Heart
 'to fulfill it. Again, 'With-
 'out the Spirit it is impossible to understand
 'them. And in his Answer to *Morc's Dia-*
logue, he sayes, 'When thou art asked, why
 'thou believest thou shall be saved by Christ?
 'answer, Thou seelest that it is true; and
 'when he asketh, How thou knowest that it
 'is true? answer, Because it is written in thy
 'Heart; if he ask, Who wrote it? answer,
 'The Spirit of God; and if he ask, How
 'thou camest first by it? tell him, Thou
 'wast inwardly taught by the Spirit of God;
 'and if he ask, Whether thou believest it
 'not, because it is written in Bo-*oks*, or be-
 'cause the Priests so preach? answer, No,
 'not now, but only because it is written in
 'thy Heart, and because the Spirit of God
 'so preacheth, and so testifieth unto thy
 'Soul, &c. Thus far *Tindal*. To him I
 will add *John Jewel*, a zealous Defender of
 the *Protestant Religion*: 'The spirit of
 'God (sayes he) is bound neither to Sha-

*See his
 Works, p.
 319, and
 p. 80.*

'ness of Wit, nor to abundance of Learn-
 'ing : Oft-times the UNLEARNED see
 'that thing that the LEARNED cannot see.
 'Therefore saith Christ, *I thank thee, O Fa-*
 'ther, *Lord of Heaven and Earth, because*
 'thou hast hid these things from the Wise and
 'Prudent, and hast revealed them unto Babes,
 'even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy
 'sight, Mat. 11. Therefore (adds he) E-
 'piphanius saith, Only to the Chil-

See his
 Reply to
 Hardings
 Answer,
 p. 393. of
 his Works
 and page
 324.

'dren of the Holy Ghost, all the
 'Scriptures are plain and easie.
 Again, 'True it is (sayes he)
 'Flesh and Blood is not able to
 'understand the Holy Will of
 'God, without SPECIAL
 'REVELATION : there-
 'fore Christ gave Thanks unto
 'his Father, for that he had re-

'vealed his Secrets unto the Little Ones;
 'and likewise opened the Hearts of his Di-
 'sciples, that they might understand the
 'Scriptures. Without this SPECIAL
 'HELP, and prompting of God's Holy
 'Spirit, the Word of God is unto the Rea-
 'der, be he never so wise, or well LEAR-
 'NED, as the Vision of a sealed Book. But
 'this

this Revelation is not special unto One, or
 Two, but GENERAL unto ALL them,
 that be the Members of Christ, and are in-
 dued with the Spirit of God: Thus far
Jewel. These men we see, although them-
 selves very well learned, yet ascribe not their
 Knowledge of God, and their understanding
 of the Scriptures unto their *Humane* Learn-
 ing, 'rudy or *Natural* Abilities; but to the
Inspiration and *Revelation* of the *Divine*
 Spirit, But let us further observe what some
 others also of that Age have said on the same
 Subject: *John Bradford*, an e-
 minent Martyr, in his Answer *Martyro-*
 to the Arch Bishop of York, says *log. vol. 3.*
 thus, 'We do believe and know *pag. 296.*
 'the scriptures, as Christ's Sheep,
 'not because the Church saith, they are the
 'Scriptures, but because they be so, being
 'thereof assured by the same Spirit that spake
 'them. *J. Philpot*, another Godly & Learned
 Martyr, having in the beginning of his Biolo-
 gical written this Sentence, *Spiritus est Vicarius*
Christi in terris; i. e. *The Spirit is Christ's*
Vicar (or in Christ's stead) *on*
Earth; gave this Answer to B. *Marty-*
Bonner, inquiring the Reason of *rology,*
 his

vol. 3. his so writing, ' Christ since his
 pag. 573 ' Ascension worketh all things in
 ' us by his Spirit, and by his Spi-
 ' rit doth dwell in us, &c. I con-
Decad. 4. clude with *Bullenger*, ' Unless
Serm. 8. ' the Holy Spirit inspire our
 ' Minds and guide our Tongues,

' we can never either speak or hear any thing
 ' concerning him with any Worth or Profit:
 ' For as none knoweth the things of God,
 ' but only the Spirit of God; so men fetch
 ' the understanding of Divine Things, and
 ' Knowledge of the Holy Ghost, from NO
 ' WHERE ELSE then from the same Spirit.
 By this, Reader, thou mayest see, that it
 was not *Humane Learning*, *Natural Study*,
 or *University Education*, that these Good
 Men trusted to of old, for the right under-
 standing of the Scriptures, but *the Spirit of*
God, which dwelt in them, from which they
 received the Understanding of Heavenly
 Things.

CHAP. IX.

Of Tythes.

I Am now come to the *Priests Delilah*, the very *Darling* and *Minion* of the *Clergy*, TYTHES; which were wont to be claimed as of *Divine Right*: but I do not find this Priest *hardy* enough to adventure his Cause upon that Title. No; though he pretends to be a Minister of the Gospel, yet he takes the Law for the *surer holding*, and therefore betakes himself chiefly to that. Yet something he would say for the other too, though not so much from himself as others. *Let me tell you*, sayes he, *that those that insist upon the Divine Right of Tythes* (as much as to say, I do not) *derive them not from Levi, but Melchizedeck*. It is then inquirable, Whether or no Tythes were ever due to *Melchizedeck*. That which should make them due, must be a *Command*. They were *not due* to the Levitical Priesthood, until they were *commanded* to be paid; but after they

were commanded to be paid, they became due: and so long as that Command stood in force, it was an Evil to detain them. But we do not find, throughout the Scriptures, any Command from God, that Tythes should be paid unto Melchizedeck. With what Reason then can any affirm, that Tythes were due unto him? That he did once receive Tythe of Abraham, I grant; but that it was not a proper Debt or just Due belonging to him, and which Abraham had done Evil in detaining, I offer these Reasons to prove;

First, That Moses sayes expressly, *Gen. 14.* He gave him Tythes: He does not say, He paid him Tythes; but He gave him Tythes: which

the Apostle referring to, useth also the same Phrase, *Hebr. 7.* To whom also Abraham gave a Tenth Part;

and again, *Vers. 4.* Unto whom even the Patriarch Abraham gave the

Tenth, &c. To give, we know, imports one thing; to pay, another. But if Tythes had been really and properly due from Abraham to Melchizedeck, it is not probable that both these holy men would have said he gave Tythes, but that he paid Tythes. 2. That if Tythes had bin due from Abraham to Melchizedeck

zedek (according as they are now demanded; which must be proved before a Divine Right to them, as they are now demanded, can be derived from *Melchizedek*) then must *Abraham* have paid *Melchizedek* Tythes of all his Substance, of all that he possessed. But no such thing appears at all. We do not read that *Abraham* gave him Tythes of his own Estate: but that which he gave him the tenth of was the Spoyle, which he had recovered from the Kings that had plundered *Sodom*, *Hebr. 7. 4.* compared with *Gen. 14.* But 3. The Occasion of *Abraham's* thus giving the tenth of the Spoyle to *Melchizedek* seems to be altogether *Accidental*. *Abraham* returning from the Battel, the King of *Sodom* came forth to meet him, to congratulate his Victory; *Melchizedek* also came forth, and brought *Abraham* a Present of Bread and Wine, to refresh him and his Soldiers after the Fight, and withal blessed him: So that *Abraham's* giving him the tenth of the Spoyle, may well be taken for a *Thankful Acknowledgment*, and *Return of Kindness* to *Melchizedek*, and the rather, seeing he had before determined. not to keep any of the Booty to his own Use, and therefore when he had given the tenth to *Melchizedek*, he returned all the rest to the King of *Sodom*,

reserving only to his Confederates their parts,
Gen. 14. 21, 24.

But the Priest would insinuate, *That this was not a Voluntary Gift of Abraham's, but that he paid it as a Tythe, pag. 134.*

Ans. If *Abraham* was not required to pay it, then surely it was a *voluntary Gift* of him. If he will say, it was required of *Abraham*, let him *show the Command* by which it was required; otherwise his Affirmation is of no force. Besides, he cannot plead (I mean rationally) that *Tythes* were due to *Melchizedek* upon a Right founded in *natural Justice and Equity*; since there was not in those dayes any settled *publick Worship*, wherein he could perform any *outward Priestly Office or Service*, for which *Tythes* might have been a *Compensation*. Nor do I find any one Instance (this single Gift of *Abraham's* excepted) of giving or receiving, much less of demanding or paying *Tythes*, in all that space of Four Hundred Years and more, between this time of *Abraham* and the *Levitical Priesthood*. If *Tythes* were then due, how chance *Abraham* paid them not duly? Nay, how shall the Patriarchs be acquitted, of whom we read not that they paid any at all. But if *Tythes* were not due to *Melchizedek* (which whether they were
 or

or no, I leave to the Reader, from what hath been said, to judge) certainly no Right thereto can be derived from him to any other. Nay further, If *Tythes* had been due to *Melchizedek*, yet could not the Clergy of this Age derive any Right from him to them, inasmuch as *they are not of his Priesthood*. For certain it is, that he was *not made a Priest after the Law of a Carnal Commandment, but after the Power of an Endless Life*. But every one knows, that these men are made Priests *after the Law of a Carnal Commandment*. These therefore, not being of *Melchizedek's Priesthood*, could have no colourable Pretence to *Tythes* from him, if *Tythes* had ever been due to him. And this the Priest (being in some things a wary man, as much overseen as he is in others) might not improbably fore-see, which made him at first so shy of adventuring his Cause upon that Issue.

But if he has no Right from *Melchizedek*, to be sure he has none from *Levi*: for he says expressly (pag. 133.) *To affirm that the Clergy now claims their Tythes by Virtue of the Ceremonial Law, is a most wretched Untruth; for (says he) we disown all such Titles to them*. So that hereby he has saved me the Pains

Pains of proving the *Levitical Law* for *Tythes* abrogated, since whether it be or no, he does (for himself and all his Brethren) *disclaim any Title by it.*

But then he starts a Question, *whether Tythes are not purely Ceremonial, and so abolished by Christ?* His Answer is, *Tythes cannot be call'd purely Ceremonial, because paid by Abraham to Melchizedeck Four Hundred Years before the Law, &c.*

Ans^r. That *Tythes* were not paid by *Abraham* to *Melchizedeck*, but given, and that but once, and that too upon an *Accidental* Occasion, nor then out of his own proper Estate (but out of the *Pillage of Sodom*, which he by the Sword had recovered from the Plunderers) I think I need not stick to say I have already proved. But suppose it had been otherwise; imagine *Tythes* to have been paid by *Abraham* to *Melchizedeck* as due, yet would not his Reason at all hold, That they are therefore not purely Ceremonial, because paid before the Law. For that were to suppose, that nothing that was done before the Law was actually given, was purely ceremonial, wherein how greatly he deceives himself, I have already shewed (by the Instances of *Circumcision* and *Sacrifices*) in the

the Chapter of *Swearing*, where the Reader may find the *Weakness* of the Argument more fully *discovered*. But observe, what in the next words, he granteth concerning it.

That the exact Tenth of the holy Land should be brought in kind to Jerusalem, and paid there, was (saith he) Ceremonial, and confined to the legal Dispensation.

Ans^r. But in what could the *Ceremoniality* lie, more then in the very Tenth it self (for as to bringing it in kind to Jerusalem, that they were not strictly tied to, but had Liberty to turn it into Money, and when they came there to lay out that Money in whatsoever their Heart *Desired*) and if its being an *exact Tenth* made it *Ceremonial*, then its being an *Exact Tenth* must needs have made it as much *Ceremonial* both before and since. *Deut. 14. 25, 26.*

But not to insist long on the Disproof of that, which he dares not undertake at all to prove, namely the divine Right of Tythes, I conclude thus, That the Payment of Tythes having never (that appears) been commanded by God to any Person, or in any time, save only by the *Levitical Law*, no man can justly plead

plead a divine Right to Tythes, since the Law was abrogated.

Not finding any sure Footing for Tythes upon a divine Right, he urgeth that *Maintenance in general to the Ministers of the Gospel, is Just, Reasonable, and established by a Divine Authority* (and this he doth in order to prove a humane and temporal Right) for which he quotes 1 Cor. 9. and Gal. 6. 6.

Answ. That a Maintenance in general to the Ministers of the Gospel is Just, Reasonable, and established by a divine Authority, I grant: But the Intent of the Apostle in those Scriptures which the Priest hath quoted, is not so much to set forth *what* the Maintenance is, as *who* they are from whom it is to be received, namely, *such as receive their Ministry, such as believe them to be true Ministers, such as are taught by them, such as are fed by them, such as are planted by them, &c.* This appears in the several Instances, *The Ox* that trod out the Corn (in the time of the Law) was *not* to be muzzled, but was to be fed by him whose Corn he trod out, but it was not agreeable to the Equity of that Law, that *while the Ox trod out Corn for one Man, another should be bound to keep him, that had been*

been unreasonable. The Apostle argues from a Souldier, a Planter, an Herdsman: *Who (saith he) goes a Warfare as any time at his own Charge? Who plants a Vineyard, and eats not of the Fruit thereof? or who feeds a Flock, and eats not of the Milk of the Flock?* Consider now, at whose Charge ought the Souldier to go, but at his for whose defence he fights? He that plants a Vineyard, may eat of the Fruit, but it must be of the Fruit thereof, that is, of the Fruit of that Vineyard which he hath planted: So he that feeds a Flock may eat of the Milk, but it must be the Milk of the Flock which he feeds. If (saith the Apostle) we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? No, because he had first sown unto them; they had received of him, and therefore he might well expect to receive of them. This still shews that the Ministers of the Gospel are not to reap carnal things of any but those to whom they have first sowed spiritual things. To the same Purpose is that to the Galatians, *Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things*; hence it is plain, that he that teacheth can expect this Communication of good things from none, but them that are taught by him

him: All therefore that can be inferred from these Instances will amount to no more then this, *First*, That a Gospel-Minister may expect and receive a Gospel-Maintenance from such as receive his Ministry. *Secondly*, That a Gospel-Minister ought not to expect any Maintenance from those that do not receive his Ministry. But what this Gospel-Maintenance is, is expressly set down *Luk 10.* by Christ himself, when he said 6, 7, 8. to his Disciples, *Eat such things* *Mat. 10.* as are set before you. *Eat and* *10.* *drink such things as they give; for the Workman is worthy of his Meat, &c.* And this is the very Maintenance which, in the Place fore-quoted by the Priest (1 Cor. 9.) the Apostle asserts he had Power to receive (*Have we not Power to eat and to drink, &c. ver. 14.*) And again, *Having Food* (saith he) *and Raiment let us therewith be content.* This was thought enough in that Day. Thus they who then preached the Gospel lived of the Gospel; and if these men were indeed Ministers of the Gospel, they also would be content with this; but this will not satisfy my greedy Adversary, nothing less then Tythes will serve his turn.

He saith (pag. 146) *The Gospel commands*

in Maintenance be provided for the Ministry, and the Civil Powers and Nursing Fathers of the Church, have set out Tythes for that Maintenance, so that (saith he) if Tythes were not due by a divine appointment, they are now due by a Voluntary Dedication of them.

Ans^r. He doth not seem to regard how he comes by them, so he may have them. If the Gospel will not give them to him, he will try what humane Law will do, and if he can get them that way it is all one to him ('Tis sufficient saith he, that our Tythes are sealed by the same Laws that your Lands are, page 138.) Though Christ deny them, yet if Men will grant them, it will serve his turn as well, which shews him to be a Minister of Man, not of Christ. If (saith he) Tythes were not due by a Divine Appointment, they are now due by a Voluntary Dedication of them. But how (saith the Parishioner) doth any such Voluntary Dedication appear? O! saith he, you need not scruple this Point, would you but give your self the Pains of consulting Antiquaries, or Church-Histories, especially that famous Charter of King Ethelwolfe set down at large by Ingulfe, where you will find the whole History of the thing, &c. I am apt, replies the Parishioner, to believe what you say, without any other Inquisition into the thing. Here's

a Parishioner now ! Oh, if he could but get all his Parishioners to be of this Mind, what a petty Pope would he be ! But, Reader, that we may not be as fondly *Credulous* as the Parishioner, let us a little examine this *Voluntary Dedication* of Tythes, and see how suitable it will be for a *Gospel Maintenance* to a *Christian-Ministry*.

He grounds his Claim upon the famous Charter (as he calls it) of King *Ethelwulf*, which is so variously reported by Historians, that few agree in the Words; or Substance of it, some seeming to restrain it to the Tythes

of his own Demesne Lands

* *Aliquam portionem terrarum hereditariam, &c* the words both in Ingulfe & Malmesbury.

* *Aliquam portionem terrarum decimarum Scil. partem terra mea;*

are the words in

Matthew of Westminster. *Decimarum Hydam terra totius W. Saxiz;* are the words in

only ; others to the tenth Part of his Land * Some to his Kingdom of West Saxony * only; others extend it to all England. But not to insist on things so doubtful, let us enquire who this *Ethelwolf* was, what his Education & Religion, whom he granted this Charter to, & what were the motives that induced him therunto.

Our Countryman Speed tells us, That *Ethelwolf* was the eldest Son of *Egbert* the Saxon that in his Youth he was committed to the Care of *Helmeſtan* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, and by him to *Swiſhan* a learned Monk of that time, that he took upon him the Vow and Profeſſion of a Monk, was made a Deacon, and ſhortly after *Helmeſtan* dying, was conſecrated (at leaſt elected) Biſhop of *Wincheſter* in his ſtead, but that after the Death of his Father, by the Intreaty of the Nobles, and Conſtraint of the Clergy, he was made King, being abſolved of his Vows by Pope Gregory the fourth, that about the time of this Grant (which was about the Year eight hundred fifty five) he went himſelf in great Devotion to *Rome*, abode there a whole Year, confirmed his former grant of *Peter Pence*, covenanted further to pay yearly Three Hundred Marks (a great Sum in thoſe Days to *Rome*, to be thus imployed, One Hundred Marks to *St Peter's Church*, another hundred to *Saint Paul's Light*, and the third to the Pope, theſe Two Hundred Marks a Year that were given to *St. Peter's Church*, and *St. Paul's Light*, were to buy Oyl to fill all the Lamps in thoſe Places, and keep them burning. This may be ſufficient to ſhew what the Education and

Religion of this Tythe-giver was. The next Question is, *To whom he granted this Charter of Tythes?* This must unavoidably be the *Popish Clergy*, that being his own Religion, and there being at that time no other publick Ministry, or Priesthood for him to give them to, and for the Motives inducing him thereunto, the very Words of the Charter are, *Pro remissione Animarum et Peccatorum nostrorum*, i. e. *For the good of our Souls, and the forgiveness of our Sins*, which shews it to be an Effect of that *Popish Doctrine*, of *meriting Salvation by good Works*, and that he granted this, as an *Expiation for his Sins*.

Here now Reader, thou maist see, what he was, whom this Priest calls a *Nursing-Father of the Church*, and what Church it was he nursed; He was bred a Monk, made a Deacon, then a Bishop, absolved from those Vows by the Pope, went in great Devotion to Rome, gave there an Hundred Marks a Year to buy Oyl to keep the Lights burning in *St. Peter's Church* (as they call it) another Hundred for the same Use to *St. Paul's*, and a third to the Pope, and granted this famous Charter (as the Priest calls it) for Tythes to the Idolatrous Priests of the Church of Rome, as an Expiation for his Sins, and a means to merit Hea-

ven, according to the *impious* Doctrine of that *Idolatrous* Church, and yet this is the *Basis* or *Foundation*, that my Opponent (a *pretended* Protestant, and one that *would be taken* for a Minister of Christ) hath laid whereon to build his Claim to^r Tythes, as a Go^pel Maintenance, namely, *The famous Charter of King Ethelwolfe*, to which he ascribes so great Virtue and Efficacy, that he saith, *If Tythes were not due by a divine Appointment, they are now due by a voluntary Dedication of them*. How suitable this Dedication of them is to be pleaded and insisted on by a *Protestant* Minister (not to say a Minister of the Gospel) in respect both of the Person, *dedicating*, the Persons *to whom*, and the End *for which* the Dedication was made, let every true Protestant judge.

To manifest yet further the *Corruption* of that time, and *Apostacy* of that Church, I will here add what the Clergy on their Part undertook in Consideration of the said Charter to perform, according as I find it set down by *Spelman* (in his *Brittish Councils*) out of *Malmsbury* and *Mari Westminster*, *It pleased also* (saith *Malmsbury*) *Alhstan and Swithin, the Bishops of the Churches of Shireburne and Winchester, with their Abbots,*

and the Servants of God, to appoint that upon the Wednesday in every Week, all our Brethren and Sisters at every Church, should sing fifty Psalms, and every Priest say two Masses, one for King Ethelwolf, and another for his Nobles that consented to this Gift, for a Reward, and for an Abatement of their Offences (Pro mercede et refrigerio delictorum suorum, are the Words: *Mat. Westm.* hath *Salute* instead of *Mercede*) and that they should say for the King so long as he lived, *Oremus Domine qui iustificas*; for his Nobles also while they lived, *Præcende Domine*, but after they were dead, for the Deceased King by himself, and for the deceased Nobles in common: And be this as firmly appointed during all the Days of Christianity, as that Liberty is appointed, so long as Faith encreaseth in the Nation of the English

And these things (saith *Ingulf* speaking of the Charter) were done at *Winchester* in the Church of *St. Peter*, in the Year of our Lord's Incarnation 855. the third Indiction on the Nones of November, before the great Altar, for the Honour of *Mary* the glorious Virgin and Mother of God, and of *St. Michael* the Arch Angel, and of the Prince of the Apostles *St. Peter*, as also of
our

our holy Father Pope Gregory. *Malmesbury* adds, *And of all Saints.* And the Charter (saith *Ingulf*) King *Ethelwolf* offered upon the Altar of St. Peter the Apostle.

But then (saith the Parishioner) they were given in a blind and superstitious Zeal, which makes all void to us: This, saith the Priest, is another mistake, for Tythes being given to God for the Maintenance of his Ministry, no Blemish in the Dedication of them can alter their Property, page 146.

Ans^r. Here he begins to speak plain (perhaps before he was aware) He tells us, That by this Dedication Tythes were given unto God for the Maintenance of his Ministry. I have shewed before that they were given for the Maintenance of the Popish Clergy; for there was not at that time any other publick Ministry for them to be given to. Now then, when he shall say they were given to maintain God's Ministry, can any other Construction be made of his Words, then that he calls that Idolatrous Priesthood of the Church of Rome, God's Ministers. Next, though it appears they were given by Papists to Papists, for Popish Service (that is in plain Protestant English, by Idolaters, to Idolaters, for Idolatrous Ends) yet he will not allow

that they were given in a *blind & superstitious Zeal*, no, *that's a Mistake*, he saith here; and again, page 147. speaking of those *Papists* that gave Tythes in an ignorant Zeal, he adds in a Parenthesis, *as some suppose, but we do not grant*. So then it seems the *Papists* Zeal in providing this Maintenance for those that were to perform their *Idolatrous Worship*, was not a *blind*, and ignorant, & *Idolatrous Zeal*. *Is this fit Language for a Protestant-Preacher's Mouth?* What Zeal is that I pray, that upholds *Idolatry*, by maintaining *Idolaters*? Is not that a *superstitious blind Zeal*? And can any hearty Protestant deny that to be the End of those *Donations*.

But he saith, That *no Blemish in the Dedication of them can alter their Propriety*.

Ans. I perceive then he is for having *all* be can get, be it dedicated by whom it will, or how it will he wants nothing but Power, to revive all the old *Donations* of the *Papists*, given in the *midnight darkness* of Popery, to redeem their Souls out of a supposed *Purgatory*; nay so general is his Affection (*No Blemish, &c.*) that *nothing* once dedicated by whomsoever, would seem to come amiss to him; not the *Offerings of the Gentiles* to their *Heathenish Deities*

ties, not the *Endowments of the Turks* to their *Mahometan Priests*, nor yet the *Thirty Pieces of Silver* (*The Price of Innocent Blood*) had *Judas* chanced to have dedicated it, would upon this Position, have been *unwelcome* to this man, could he once but have got them into Possession.

To make good his Assertion, he offers a *parallel Case* (as he calls it) in *Scripture*, That (sayes he) which comes neareſt is the *Case of Two Hundred and Fifty Men*, who offered *Incense*; yet there was a vast Difference between them: the *Two Hundred and Fifty* offer'd in a *Stubborn Rebellious Manner*, and these in an *Ignorant Zeal* (as some suppose, but we do not grant) p. 147.

Anſw. Observe, Reader, that this *Case of Corah, Dathan and Abiram*, with the *Two Hundred & Fifty Men* offering *Incense*, is brought to parallel the *Dedication of Tythes*, by which he sayes they are now due. The two hundred and fifty offered (he says) in a *stubborn rebellious Manner*, and he calls it a *Damnable Sin*; yet makes that a *parallel Case* to this of offering *Tythes*, and sayes, it comes moſt near it. Has he not found out a pretty *Parallel*) Has he not matcht his *Case* well?

But that (says he) which will give us most Light into our present Case, are the Censers which were so offered, which you will find, notwithstanding that D^{mn}able Sin committed in the Consecration of them; yet because they were offered to God, they were not to be alienated to common Uses, Numb. 16. 37.

Ans^r. There was a particular Reason given, why the Censers should be taken up and kept, namely, to be as a Sign and Memorial, and as a Warning unto the Children of Israel, that no Stranger in time to come, who was not of the Seed of Aaron, should adventure to offer Incense before the Lord, lest he should speed as Corah and his Company had done, Vers. 40. Yet though they were thus taken up, they were not permitted to be used, or employed in that Service, to and for which they were dedicated or consecrated; but being wrought out into broad Plates, the Property of them was altered before they were allowed to be used.

But he goes on: From hence (says he) you may learn how dangerous a thing it is to meddle with any thing that hath been given to God.

Ans^r. I need not, I suppose, tell the Impropiators, that this concerns them; for it is obvious, that if because Tythes have been

been dedicated (as he sayes) to God, it is unlawful to alienate them to Common Uses, then it must needs be unlawful for them to hold their Impropriations. because they were offered in like manner as the rest of the *Tithes* were. But let them look to themselves. Were not all the Abbey Lands and the Revenues belonging to the Religious Houses (as in the time of *Papery* they were called) offered also to God as well as *Tithes*? And yet have not all (or most) of these been alienated to *Common Uses*? By whom was this Alienation made? Was it not by some or other of his *Nursing-Fathers*? And will this Priest, like a saucy and unthankful Son, take upon him to censure the publick Acts of his *Nursing-Fathers*, to whom he owes the Maintenance he has? But ye whose Ancestors did at first buy these Lands from the Crown, and into whose Possession they are now come, either by Descent or Purchase, what think ye of this? Are ye satisfied with his Plea, and willing to resign? Ye hear what he sayes, *That no Blemish in the Dedication of them can alter their Property, and that (from the Parallel of the Censers) because they were offered to God, they were*

not

not to be alienated to Common Uses. Nay, he tells you, *Hence you may learn how Dangerous a thing it is to meddle with anything that hath been given to God.* And do you think, that if he had Power, you should not hear of this after another Manner? 'Tis not to be doubted, but he that now tells you, they should *not* have been alienated, will be as ready, if Opportunity serve, to let you know that *what should not have been Alienated, must be Restored.* But leaving this to your Consideration, that which I shall observe is, that *Tithes*, and other such like Oblations (notwithstanding what he sayes to the contrary) are alienable, and in this Nation have been legally alienated to Common Uses.

In his Margin he sayes, *Factum valet, quod fieri non debuit*, i. e. That which ought not to be done, is notwithstanding of force (or binding) when it is done.

Ans. 1. I must tell him, his Saying will not hold true in all Cases: I instance in that of *Herod's Oath* (by which *John Baptist* lost his Head) which as it should not have been taken, so neither ought it to have been kept when taken. 2. Though by this he would infer, that *Tithes*, being offered & dedicated,
ought

ought to be upheld, which his *Factum valet* imports; yet he thereby implicitly (and unawares) acknowledges, that they ought not to have been off'r'd or dedicated at all, which his *fieri non debuit* implies.

But after all this, he has the Confidence to say, that *Tythes* had not their Institution from Popery; for sayes he, *Tythes* were settled upon the Church before Popery had made her Incroachments in it, p. 148.

Ans^r. If he had any Charter or Settlement of *Tythes* of older date than that of *Ethelwolf* (which was about the year 855.) he should have produced it, and probably so he would. However, since he did not, I have no Reason to think he has any elder. But if he means, that *Ethelwolf*, who gave this Charter, was not himself a Papist, that the Times he lived in were not Popish, or that Popery had not then made her Incroachments upon the Church, I must then remind my Reader of that Character which our Countryman *Spred out of Hovden, Huntington, Malmsbury, Mat. Westminster*, and others) gives us of him: He sayes expressly, *Ethelwolf was bred up by Swithin the Monk*, that he took upon him the Vow and Profession of a Monkish Life; that he was absolved and

discharged of his Vows by the Authority of Pope Gregory the fourth, whose Creature (saith Speed) he was in both Professions; That he went himself in great Devotion to Rome; that being there he confirmed his grant of Peter-Pence, and further covenanted to pay yearly Three Hundred Marks to Rome, whereof One Hundred to St. Peter's Church, One Hundred to St. Paul's Light, and One Hundred to the Pope. And after all this is not Ethelwolf a Papist? then it may be Gregory the fourth was not a Pope neither, although (according to Platina) he was the thirty seventh from Gregory the great.

Or will he say, that in the Time of Ethelwolf Popery had not made her Encroachments in the Church? What he will call Encroachments I know not, but this I find, that well near an Hundred Years before that Charter of Ethel-

<p>Fascic. Temp. in Zach. Pap. Burdgal. Chronog. in eundem.</p>	<p>wolf was granted, Pope Zacharias the first took upon him to absolve the French from their Oath of Allegiance, and deposing Childerick King of France, set up Pipin in his stead.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

But seeing he saith that Tyses were settled upon the Church before Popery had made her Incroachments in it

(re-

(referring to *Erbelwolfe's* Charter for the Settlement) and withal tells us what he means by Popery, namely, *such Doctrines, and Superstitious Practices, which by the Corruption of time, have prevailed in the Church of Rome, contrary to the True, Ancient, Catholick and Apostolick Church*, page 149. Let us a little enquire whether any such Doctrines, or Practices had indeed prevailed in the Church at the time of this Grant or before.

The time of the Grant *Spelman* in his *Brittish Councils* sets down to be in the Year Eight Hundred Fifty Five: More then Two Hundred and Fifty Years before this, came over *Austin the Monk* with his Train from *Rome*. That many Corruptions both in Doctrine and Practice, were before this time crept into the Church of *Rome*, is clear from History, and that *Austin* brought them over hither with him, is not to be doubted.

The Use of Holy water to drive away Devils, is said to be instituted by *Alexander the first*. *See Fascic. Temporum.*
The Consecration of Chrism once a Year, by *Fabianus*. *Platina & Burdega.*
should stand up at the reading of the Gospel (as they call it) by Anasimus. *lensis.*
That Wax Tapers should be consecrated

secrated on the Holy Sabbath, by Zozimus. That Processions should be made on Sundays (as they speak) by Agapetus; All which were long before Austin the Monk came over. But whether this Priest be Protestant enough to call these things Popish Corruptions, and Superstitions, I know not. Let us go on still towards the time of Ethelwolfe's Charter, on which he grounds his settle-

Platina in ment of Tythes. Pope Con-
Vita ejus. stantine the first (about the Year Seven Hundred) called a Council, wherein was decreed, That the Images of the Fathers should be painted upon the Wall of St. Peter's Church-Porch. His

S Successor Pope Gregory the second, when the Emperor Leo the third, to remove the Cause of Idolatry, set forth an Edict, Commanding that all Statues and Images of Saints, Martyrs and Angels should be wholly ta-

Platina in Commanding that all Statues
vita ejus. and Images of Saints, Martyrs and Angels should be wholly taken away out of their Churches, openly without the Emperor's Edict, and saith Fasciculus Temporum, did anathematize the Emperor to boot. And Pope Gregory the third, who came next after, not only called a general Council to establish

establish the worshipping of Images,
 but also took upon him to excom-
 municate the Emperor, and which
 is yet more to depose him. Za-
 charias the next Pope took upon
 him not only to absolve the
 French from their Oath of Alle-
 giance, but also to depose Child-
 rick the French King, and set up
 Pipin in his Stead, as fitter for his Turn.
 And had not Popery, will this Priest say, made
 her Encroachments yet. Not long after this (&
 Four score Years or more before Ethelwolve's
 Charter) Constantine the Second got the Pope-
 dom by evil means, and by as evil kept it, un-
 til at length he was plucked down, and his Eyes
 put out; nor was he the first Pope of this
 Stamp. The Author of Fascic. Temp. con-
 fesses there were four more such infamous
 Popes before him. Besides all this, Bede the
 Saxon (who was dead long before Ethelwolve
 was born (in his Ecclesiastical History, a
 bounds with Stories of strange
 kind of Miracles, wrought by the
 Reliques of Popish Saints, as Ose-
 wald, Hilda and others, nor on-
 ly so, but by the Wood of the
 Cross also, and by holy Water.

Platina in
 vita ejus.

Burdegal.
 Fascicul.
 Tempor.

Lib. 3. c.
 11. & 13.
 Lib. 3. c.
 2. Lib: 5.
 cap. 4.

But

But in the 14th. chap. of his 4th. Book there is particular mention of an *Extraordinary* Miracle wrought by the *Intercession* of Oswald King of Northumberland, who had been dead long before. So that that popish Doctrine of the *Intercession* of *Saints* appears by Beda to have been received in the then Church of England, a great while before Ethelwolfe's Charter for Tythes was thought on.

Many more Instances of this kind might be produced, but these I judge sufficient to satisfy the Reader how greatly that Age wherein Ethelwolf lived (and several Ages before) were overcast and clouded with the *Darkness* and *Ignorance* of Popery, and by what a blind Zeal and Superstitious Devotion, the men of those times were affected. Whence it may appear that Doctrines and Superstitious practices, contrary to the true, ancient, catholick and apostolick Church (which is his Definition of Popery) had prevailed in the Church of Rome (from which Austin came, & by which he formed his Church here) before Tythes were given; and consequently that Tythes had their Institution from Popery: Unless the Priest will say, that the Instances I have here produced are not superstitious practices, are not Popery, are not contrary to the true

true, ancient, Catholick and Apostolick Church; which if he will say, he need say no more to let us know what Religion he is of, nor tell his Name till he come to *Rome*.

That which I desire the Reader to observe from this is, that the *Institution of Tythes* (since Christ's time) the *Voluntary Dedication of them*, so highly talked of (and from which they are claimed to be *now due*) the famous *Charter of Ethelwolf* (so dearly hug'd by this Priest) was but the Grant and Gift of a *Popish Prince*, in an ignorant, blind, superstitious Zeal to the *Idolatrous Priesthood* of the *Romish Church*, and for an *Erroneous End*.

But that which he thinks will help him off is this, *That Cranmer, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Taylor and Bradford received Tythes*, page 149.

Answer This will not do his Business. That these were *Godly Men, and worthy Martyrs* I grant: Yet will not their receiving *Tythes* make them either *Lawful*, or *less popish*, in the *Institution*. The Lot of those good men fell in the *very Spring and Dawning* (as it were) of the *Day of Reformation*, and it was their *Happiness and Honour* that they were *faithful* (even to the *Death*) to those *Disco-*

veries of *Truth* which they received. But *all Truths* were not discovered at once, nor *all Untruths* neither. But it being a Day of the *Infancy* of Reformation, it pleased God in his infinite *Wisdom and Tenderness*, to rend the Vail as it were by *little and little*, and so discover things *gradually* unto them, that they might go *cheerfully* on in their Testimony, and not come under those *Discouragements*, which the *Sight* of so many *Difficulties* at once, might not improbably have brought upon them. Nor will this seem strange to any who shall seriously consider, that many of the blessed Martyrs, who sealed their *Testimony* with their Blood, and entred *cheerfully* the *fiery Chariot*, had not so full and clear a *Sight* of *all* the *Superstitions* and *Abominations*, which in the dark Night of Ignorance, had crept into the Church of *Rome*, as it has pleased God *since* to give. Yet they being faithful to the Lord in what they did see, were accepted by him, and *through Death received a Crown of Life*.

Neither is it a *fair way* of reasoning, because some who lived but at the *Day-break* (as it were) of Reformation, did not at that *early Hour* discover the *whole Mystery* of *Iniquity* (although they did a *great part*) or
bore

bore Testimony against every particular Evil in the Church of *Rome* (although they did against a great many) thence to argue, that the Mystery of Iniquity extended no further then was discovered unto them, or that there was *no other* Evil in the Church of *Rome*, but what they testified against, especially since we find divers things which they took little or no Notice of, *plainly condemned*, and zealously witnessed against by others, who are acknowledged to have been in their respective times, *Confessors* of and true *Witnesses* for God against the *Corruptions* and *Superstitions* of the Romish Church, as well as they; so that what my Opponent saith in another Case (page 114) *You must not interpret one Scripture to overthrow other plain Scriptures* the same say I in this, he ought not to instance these mens receiving Tytes to *overthrow*, or *contradict* the plain Testimonies of other faithful Servants of God, who denied them, but rather as in the Beginning of Christianity the Apostles did not all alike oppose the Ceremonies of the Law, but Circumcision and other Rites, were

Acts 16.

3. & 18.

18. & 21

26.

X 2

jected

jected and denied by all, which yet neither ought to have been, nor was made use of by the rest of the Apostles or Churches, as an Argument for the lawfulness and Continuation of Circumcision, or any other of the Jewish Rites: So in the Testimonies of those holy Martyrs and Confessors of Jesus, what was denied by some, and witnessed against as *Popish, Superstitious and wicked*, ought not to be received, and defended now as *not Popish or Superstitious* (at least by such as pretend to reverence their testimonies) because the same things were not denied by all; for God is not limitable to *Numbers of Witnesses*, but he raised up *one* to bear Testimony against *one* Corruption, *another* against *another* Superstition; some stormed *one Part* of *Babylon*, some *another*, but did not make their Batteries *all in one Place*: Now that *Tythes* were denied by *many* of those godly men, *Fox's Martyrology* assures us in the Instances of *Thorp, Swinderby, Brute, Wickliff, &c.* Some of whom complained of the *Abuse* of *Tythes*, in that they were then *fixt and settled as a Payment*, whenas but a little before they were a *voluntary free Gift*, disposeable at the *Will and Pleasure* of the Giver: Others *utterly denying and rejecting* them,

them, as *no way lawful at all*; nay *Thorp* saith expressly, *That those Priests that do take Tythes, deny Christ to be come in the Flesh*, urging it as the Opinion of one of the Doctors, and as he thinks of *Jerome*. And *Brace* saith, not only that *no man is bound to pay Tythes in Gospel-times*, but that *it is manifest and plain, that neither by the Law of Moses; nor by Christ's Law, Christian People are bound to pay Tythes, but by the Traditions of Men*. Hence what Opinion these good men had of Tythes, the Reader may judge. but for any now to urge, in Defence and Justification of Tythes, that *Cranmer, Hooper, Ridley*, and other Godly Martyrs received them, what else is this, but to oppose the Martyrs one to another, and render them, as *clashing and warring amongst themselves*; yea and to endeavour, by the Practices of some, to *invalidate and make the Testimony of others utterly void and of no Force*, which I am sure does ill become any Protestant to do; and indeed I think none, *that were truly such* would ever have attempted it. But to go on.

From *Divine Right* (which he only nibbles at, but dares not trust his Cause upon, as having *no Place in holy Writ*, from whence

he might derive it, and from *Donation*, or *Voluntary Dedication* of *Tithes* in former Ages (which is here proved to be at best *but Popish*) he betakes himself to his last and surest Refuge, *Humane Laws*, making *Tithe* to be but a *Temporal Right* in the same manner, and of the same Tenure that other mens *Estates* are, that so he may introduce a Plea to hold and enjoy *Tithes* by the same Right, and with the same Reason, that any other man enjoys his *Temporal Estate*. For when in page 135, 136. he is prest to show us her a *Precept*, where God hath commanded *Tithes* to be paid, or an *Example*, where the *Apostles* did receive them (and this urged also from a *Thesis* of his own, viz. That *Precept* or *Example* in holy Scripture, must certainly be the Guide of all our *Actions*) he to avoid the Force of it, insinuates that he is no more obliged to show such *Precept*, or *Example* for his taking *Tithes*, than any other man is for the enjoying of his *Temporal Estate*. I'll show you the *Mistake* saith he (I thought he had not counted it a *Mistake* for men to take precept or *Example* in holy Scripture for the Guide of all their *Actions*) *Ten*, saith he, challenge so many Acres of Ground, &c. Now to make you a good property in this *Estate*, you must

must shew either some positive Scripture for your Right to hold the same, or an Example from Christ or the Apostles, that they had Free Holds, &c. To this the Parishioner replies, I shall soon discover your Fallacy, by telling you, that I enjoy my Estate as a Temporal Right.

Ans. But that is not all, I shall discover his Fallacy further, by telling him, not only that I enjoy my Estate as a Temporal Right, but also that I claim it in a Natural and Civil Capacity, without Relation to a Ministerial Function, or Spiritual Office, as a Man, not as a Minister of Christ. But the Priest doth not claim Tythes in this Capacity. He claims in a Spiritual Capacity (although his Claim be false) his Claim depends upon a Ministerial Function. He claims not as a Man, but as a Minister of Christ (for such he pretends to be, though he be not) His claim therefore to Tythes, and my claim to my temporal Estate, differing in the very Ground and Nature of them, that which will make good my claim to my Estate, will not make good his claim to Tythes. For my claim to my Estate being grounded upon a Natural, or Temporal Consideration only, a Temporal Right is sufficient to make it good. But his

Claim to Tythes being grounded upon a *Spiritual* Consideration (as he pretends to be a Minister of Christ) a *Temporal* Right is no way equal, or *suitable* to his Claim. So that he hath still need (if he would still take Tythes, and still be reputed a Minister of Christ) to produce a *Precept* where God hath commanded Tythes to be paid under the Gospel, or an *Example*, where Christ or his Apostles did receive them. Which if he cannot do, *he is justly to be reputed no Minister of Christ*, since they that are indeed his Ministers, are able to shew both Precept and Example for the Maintenance which they receive

But saith he, page 137. *If the Consideration of a Temporal Right be sufficient to satisfy your Conscience, in a Temporal Enjoyment, by the same Reason I can hold my Tythes without any Wound to my Conscience.*

Ans. How hard his Conscience is (to be wounded) especially in a Case so profitable to him as Tythes, I will not undertake to lay. Yet thus far I will, that if his Conscience were not harder then it should be, I am sure he could not satisfy it in taking Tythes. That which gives Satisfaction to mine, or any other man's Conscience, in the *Temporal* Enjoyment

joyment of a *Temporal Estate*. is the Consideration that he claims it *only* in a *Natural* and *Civil* Capacity, *as a man* (without any respect to a *Spiritual* Imployment) and that in that Capacity he hath a *Temporal Right* unto it. But is the Case thus with the Priest ? Doth he claim *Tithes* purely in a *Natural* and *Civil* capacity, *as a man* (without any respect to a *Spiritual* Imployment) or doth he claim them upon a *Religious* Score, *as a Minister of Christ* (though not one) and in Consideration of a *Ministerial Office*, or *Spiritual Function*, which he *pretends* to execute ? If so, how dares he then say, that by the same Reason which satisfies other mens Consciences, in the Enjoyment of their *Temporal Estates*, he can hold *Tithes* without any Wound to his Conscience ! Certainly, by *confounding* these so *different* Considerations of *Natural* and *Spiritual*, *Civil* and *Religious* Capacities, he hath argued very *fallaciously* and *craftily*, endeavouring to beguile his Reader with meer *Sophistry*. And after the same manner he goes on

What have you to shew for your Estate, saith he to his Parishioner ? *I have a good Died*, replieth the Parishioner : *But what have you to shew for your Glebe and Tithes ? I have a*
good

good Tithes and Endowment, cries the Priest. Prove that Tithes and Endowment to be right by the Law of God, saith the Parishioner. So I will, quoth the Priest, when your Deed is made good by the Law of God. It is sufficient, saith the Parishioner, that my Deed is approved by the Law of the Land. So it is sufficient, replies the Priest, that our Tithes are settled by the same Laws.

Ans. Observe here, Reader, how willing the Priest is, for his own Interest, to parallel his Case with the Parishioner's, as if there were no Difference at all in their claims. One claims a Temporal Thing, and the other claims a Temporal Thing. One claims by a Temporal Right, and the other claims by a Temporal Right. One hath no Need of a Precept or Example in holy Scripture for what he claims, no more hath the other. Thus he takes his Parishioner by the Nose, and endeavours to cokes him into a Conceit, that their Cases answer pat to one another, that their Right is all one, their Claim one and the same, their pretensions just alike. But then they must not stay there, the priest must also acknowledge, he is no more a Minister of Christ, than the other, at least, that he doth not claim Tithes as a Minister of Christ, any
more

more then the other doth his *Temporal Estate*; otherwise the *Parall* I will not hold. For if he claims Tythes as a *Minister of Christ*, if he demands them in *Consideration of a Spiritual Office*, I am sure then their Claims will not agree; and that which will be sufficient to make good a Title to the one, will not be so to the other, whatever he thinks on't. A good *Deed* for a *Temporal Estate*, sounds somewhat like; but a *Terrier and Endowment* for a *Minister of Christ*, is new and strange Language, which Christians are not acquainted with. And for a *Temporal Estate*, held in a *Civil Capacity*, it is sufficient that the *Deed* be approved by the Laws of the Land, because the Estate it self is claimed, and held upon no other Considerations, then such as are *Temporal*. But it is otherwise in the case of Tythes: A *Temporal Settlement* of Tythes is not sufficient, because Tythes are claimed upon Considerations that are not *Temporal*, but *Spiritual*.

But the Parishioner puts the Question, If Tythes are *Temporal Rights*, how come you to call them *Spiritual Preferments*? The Priest answers, All Tythes are not so called, because all *Impropriations* are held in a *Layty*, &c.

Ans. By this then it appears, that if the
Im-

Impropriations are held in a Laity, Tythes are not so *Sacred* a thing, but that they *may be* and are *alienated* to common Uses, notwithstanding the *Dedication* of them, and whatever else he saith elsewhere (page 146, 147.) to the contrary.

But other Tythes, the Priest saith, are called spiritual Preferments, not in respect of the Profits, but the Persons who are capable of them, and therefore are they vulgarly called spiritual Preferments, because enjoyed by spiritual Persons, page 137.

Ans. So then it seems the *Persons* enjoying Tythes must be *Spiritual*, yea so *Spiritual* as to communicate to the Tythes themselves the Denomination of *Spiritual Preferments*, and yet they must be held by a *Temporal Right*; and why? but because they have no *Spiritual Right* to them. But letting that pass, two things I desire to be resolved in. *First*, Why these Priests, who bid such *Defiance* to the *Inspiration of the Spirit*, should affect to call themselves *Spiritual Persons*? *Secondly*, Seeing towards the Beginning of his Book (page 11.) he saith, *some men for a corrupt Interest will intrude themselves into these Sacred Offices*; and again, near the End of it (page 160.) He tells us, the *Secu-*
cular

lar Care of some of the Clergy, for the Maintenance of their Families, hath been excessive: I would gladly know whether he reckons these for some of his Spiritual Persons, seeing these do enjoy the Preferments as well as any.

He tells us (in page 140.) That which no Body doubts, viz. *That Temporal Authorities have Power to establish Temporal Rights; from whence (in page 141.) he infers, That in Temporal Affairs, an Argument drawn from Temporal Authority (where the thing is equitable and Reasonable) is a good and convincing Argument; and in the next page, taking an Oecasion to repeat, he saith, I do not say in every Case a Temporal Authority can create a Right to a Temporal Interest, but in such Cases only as are Equitable and Reasonable.*

Ans. I observe here he reels from establishing a Right to creating a Right: I hope he doth not think that to establish & create is one and the same thing. Let him stick to which he pleaseth, so he will be pleased without confounding them. If he will say that Temporal Authority hath created a right to Tythes, he thereby cuts off all Pretensions to any Right antecedent to that Creation. If he will say
that

that *Temporal Authority* hath only established a *Temporal Right* to Tythes, that suppolet a *Temporal Right* to them before. But that will lye at his Door to prove, which hitherto he hath not in any Degree done; unless to say it, be a Degree of doing it, and then indeed he hath done it in many Degrees. For he hath said it over and over. If Tythes, saith he, be another man's Estate and Property, the Case will be clear against me; but this, saith he, is begging of the Question: therefore I am ready to prove that Tythes are mine, not his, from whom I receive them. Here he saith he is ready to prove, but I wonder when he will do it. After a Periphrasis of three pages or more, he brings his Discourse to this Issue, If you will grant, saith he, that Maintenance in general is due by the Tenour of the Gospel, you will sufficiently justify Tythes from all the idle Cavils which are brought against them (page 145.) Is not this notably argued to prove Tythes his, not theirs from whom he receiveth them, especially from one that was in such Readiness too! Well, I'll grant him that Maintenance in general is due by the Gospel to a Gospel Minister, and now let us see what he can make on't. Why, saith he (pag. 146.) The Gospel commands a Maintenance

be provided for the Ministry, and the Civil Powers, and Nursing Fathers of the Church, have set out Tythes for that Maintenance: To prove this, he urges a Voluntary Dedication of them; and to prove that, offers Eshelwolfe's Charter. The Dedication and Charter I have already examined, and shewed how little they conduce to this Cause. Therefore not to repeat the same things, let us now inquire what Power those Nursing Fathers had to set out Tythes for a Maintenance for the Ministry.

He that appointed a Maintenance in general, described also that Maintenance in particular. In the same House, saith Christ, remain, eating and drinking such things as they give, Luke 10. 7. So again, ver. 8. Eat such things as are set before you. For the Workman is worthy of his Meat, Mat. 10. 10. Here was the Maintenance which Christ appointed for his Ministers, which was altogether Free and Voluntary. But where hath Christ given Power to any man to alter this Maintenance, and set up another in the Room of it? Doubtless if any such Authority were given, it concerns them that claim thereby, to shew it. But if Christ hath given no such Power, whence then doth man take so much upon

upon him? Yet suppose Magistrates had such a Power to appoint Maintenance, yet for any Magistrate to set out Tythes for that Maintenance, is a *direct Opposition* to Christ. For Tythes having been commanded by God in the Mosaical Law, to be paid unto the Levitical Priesthood, and Christ having *disannulled* that Law, and *taken away Priests, Tythes and Law altogether* (Heb. 7.) what greater *Affront* can be offered to Christ, what greater *Contempt* shewed of him, then to *set up* that which he hath *thrown down*, to *establish* that which he hath *abolished*.

But sayes he (pag. 154.) *if the Quakers can prove from the Laws of God or right Reason, that it is not Lawful for every one to do what he will with his own, and consequently that he may not settle Tythes, Lands or Monies upon the Clergy, then they do something to the Purpose.*

Answ Well then, that I may be sure to do something, *even in his Sense*, to the purpose, I will prove both from the Laws of God and right Reason, that it is not Lawful for every Man to do what he will with his own. The Earth is the Lord's, and the Fulness thereof: whatsoever Man enjoyes of it, he holds but in *Stewardship* from God, and must

must give an Account thereof unto his Lord. His Eye must be to his Master, in the Use and Disposing of what he hath received from him, and calls his own. *He may not imploy it to an Evil Use.* He ought to Honour God with all his Substance; but he ought not to honour the Devil with one Farthing. He may not spend his Substance upon his Lusts, nor bestow it among Harlots. (The Prodigal, that wasted his Portion after that manner, confessed, *He had sinned against Heaven*, Luke 15. 21. And the Steward, that was accused for wasting his Master's Goods, was called to an Account therefore, and *turned out* of his Office, Chap. 16. see also Eccles. 11. 9. & 12. 14.) They mistake greatly, that think man so independent and uncontrollable, that he may do what he will with the Goods he possesses, and imploy them to what Use he pleases. *He may not make an Idol of them, neither may he uphold Idolatry with them.* In these, and very many Cases more it is not lawful for any man (either by the Law of God or right Reason) to do what he will with his own. Will any Protestant be so inconsiderate as to say, that it is lawful for a Man to lay out his Money in Beads, Crosses, Crucifixes, Agnus Dei's, and such like Trumpery? Will he

say it is *Lawful to buy Masses, Prayers, Pardons, Indulgences, &c?* Will he say it was *lawful*, by the Law of God, for *Ethelwolf* at *Rome* to give *Two Hundred Marks a Year* to buy *Oyl*, to keep *St. Peters's Lamps* and *St. Paul's Lamps* burning? If he thinks this justifiable, let him defend it; if not, he may in this very Instance see, both that it is *not Lawful* for every man to do what he will with his own, and also that *Ethelwolf*, his great Donor and Patron, did that with his own that was *not lawful* for him to have done, namely, *uphold Superstition and Idolatry*. Nor did he transgress in this Instance *only*, of giving that Yearly Pension to *Rome*, but in his Donation of *Tithes* also; for it is evident he gave them to *maintain a Popish Clergy*, & generated from Apostolical Purity, and *fully corrupt* both in Doctrine and Practice, in upholding of which he did *that which was Evil*, and therefore to be sure Unlawful.

And if it was *not lawful* for him to do what he would with *his own*, how much *less lawful* then was it for him to do what he would with that which was *none of his own*, but other mens! If he did *not well* in giving that which was *his own* for the Maintenance of a False Ministry, surely then he did *worse* in giving, to the same Use, that which was *not his*

own, but other mens; which yet he must needs do, if indeed he gave the *Tythes* of the whole Nation, as some alledge, and as they are now received. For though he were a King, yet no man I think will say, that he had thereby Power of disposing or giving away other mens Properties. If as King he had such a Power, then farewel Property to all Subjects. If he had not such Power rightfully, yet did it, that Deed's unjust, and the Charter therefore void. But if he neither had nor used such Power, but only decimated his own Ecclesiastical Lands (as some understand) then cannot any general Claim to *Tythes* be derived from his Charter.

But suppose that *Ethelwolf* had an ample Power of disposing what he pleased, or that the People had by Consent joyned with him in the Donation, every man according to the Interest he had; yet neither could he single, nor he and they conjoyned, grant any more then belonged to themselves. They were possessors of the Lands, and enjoyed the Profits. These they might dispose of (*I do not say to an Evil Use*) of these they might have given what part they pleased. If they had given the Tenth Part of the Land, the tenth Acre (in which Sense some understand the

words of the Charter [*aliquam portionem terrarum hereditariam*] in *Ingulf*) how *unrighteous* soever it had been in respect of the Use and End to and for which it had been given, yet they to whom it had been so given had thereby had a *distinct Property* and Possession. If they had had a mind to have given the tenth part of the yearly Profits (which I know is the thing aimed at) that, I grant, they might have done *for themselves*, and *during their Lives* such Gift would have been of force against them, being bound by their own Act. But for them to make a grant of the *tenth* part of the *Profits* of the Land forever, is (to my Understanding) utterly repugnant to Reason, Justice and Equity. For it must be consider'd, that by the Profits of the Land is not understood the *natural* only, but the *artificial Product* thereof, not what the Earth of *her own accord*, without any Help of Man, *brings forth* (which I think would be little, and comparatively little worth) but what by the painful *Labour*, continual *Tyol*, daily *Sweat*, thoughtful *Care* and great *Charge* of the *diligent and industrious Husbandman*, is *digged*, and as it were *torn out of her Bowels*. So that in the Profits of the Land (rightly computed)

puted) the *Labour, Sweat, Care, Charge, Skill, Industry, Diligence, &c.* of the *Husbandman* are inc'uded, and that *inseparably*: for these are indeed the *Instrumental Causes* of Production. To admit then a Power in any man, to give the Tythes of the *Profits* of his Land, beyond his own Life, were to suppose a Power in that Man to give away the *Labour, Care, Skill, Charge, Diligence, Industry* of another. But that Reason gainsays. For though a man may give away his own Pains, Charge, &c. may make himself a Bondslave, if he will, and devote himself wholly to labour for others: yet can he not impose this Condition upon others. For as till it was voluntarily undertaken by him, he was under no Obligation to it: so in like manner until it be voluntarily undertaken by others, they are under no Obligation to it. Now for any one to plead, that *Ethelwolf* (or any other man) hath given him the Tythes of the *Profits* of that Land that I possess or occupy, is all one as if he should tell me, that *Ethelwolf* (or some other) hath given him my *Labour, Pains, Charge & Care, Skill, Industry, Diligence, Understanding, &c.* seven or eight Hundred Years, it may be, before either he or I was born; a thing

most ridiculous, and utterly inconsistent with Reason.

Nor is it more agreeable to Justice and Equity. For if *Ethelwolf*, a *Papist*, gave Tythes to the *Romish* Clergy, he did it upon a Consideration, for the Health of his

* *Remissione animarum, & peccatorum nostrorum*, are the Words of the Charter in *Ingulf*, as *Spelman* gives them in his *British Councils*. Anno Christi, 855.

Soul and Remission of his Sins, * which he believed he might obtain in that Church, & by the Help of that Ministry to whom he gave his Tythes, and Mediation of those Saints in Honour of whom he granted this Charter. And on the

other hand, the Clergy undertook, that all the Holy Brethren and Sister at every Church (as they called it) should upon every Wednesday in the Year sing Fifty Psalms, and say Two Masses, one for the King, and t'other for his Dukes or Nobles. Here was a Consideration, and such an one as in that day was thought valuable too. But all that are true Protestants know full well, that this Consideration is of no value now (nor indeed ever was; though, by the Ignorance of those Times,

Times, it was then so reputed.) Now if the *Consideration* (good or bad) be taken away, why should the *Charge* be continued? If the *End*, for which *Tythes* were given, neither be nor can be now answered, with what Justice or Equity can *Tythes* be now demanded? But how much more unjust and unequal will it then appear, that *Tythes* should be now exacted, and extorted by a Protestant Ministry, upon a *Donation* fraudulently obtained by a *Popish* Clergy! If *Tythes* were ever indeed due to any by virtue of this Gift, it must be to the *Popish* Priests, and all the *Rabble* of their Religious Men and Women: for to them were they given, and that too upon such Terms, and to such Ends, as the Protestant Religion disowns and rejects. How dishonourable therefore is it for a Protestant Minister to lay hold, as it were, on the Skirts of a *Papist*, and endeavour to derive a Right to *Tythes* from that Church, which hath long since anathematized them for Hereticks, and which they also were wont formerly to call *Antichristian*.

Besides, the Reasons urged why *Tythes* are now due, viz. the *voluntary Dedication*, *Donation* and *Charter*, will be certainly as

strong and cogent (if not somewhat more) for the Payment of Tythes to the *Popish* Priests, if ever they should be suffered to get up again: for to *them* were they dedicated, to *them* were they given, to *them* was the Charter granted. Nor has this Priest said *any thing* in Proof of his Claim to Tythes, which might not as reasonably (and in this Respect somewhat more colourably) be said by one of the *Popish* Clergy. One sayes, a *Maintenance in general* is appointed in the Gospel: so sayes t'other. One sayes, the *Civil Powers*, and *Nursing-Fathers* of the Church have set out Tythes for that Maintenance: so sayes t'other. One sayes, there was a *voluntary Dedication* of them, a *famous Charter* given for them. Aye, so there was indeed sayes the other, and which is more, *that Dedication was made to our Church* (in Honour of Mary the Glorious Virgin and Mother of God, and in Honour of St. Michael the Arch-Angel, and of Saint Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and also in Honour of our Holy Father Pope Gregory, as the words of the Charter in *signifare*) and that Charter was granted to us. Thus, Reader, thou seest that the same Reasons this Man
 nies

uses to prove Tythes due to him, a *Popish* Priest may *as well* use to prove Tythes due to him. But as the Author to the *Hebrews*, speaking of the Levitical Priesthood, saith (chap. 7. 12.) *The Priesthood being changed (which took Tythes) there is made of Necessity a Change also of the Law (which commanded Tythes)* so I say in this Case. The Church of *Rome*, and her Priesthood, being cast off, disowned, denied and rejected: There is a *Necessity* (if ye will be true Christians, and true Protestants) that all her Dedications, Oblations, Donations, Grants, Charters of Tythes, Glices, Offerings, Obventions, Collations, Terriers, Endowments, Benefices, and whatsoever else is of the like Nature, and crept in under the Corruption of her degenerate State, be utterly renounced, made void and cancelled to all Intents and Purposes.

Besides, the *Injustice*, and *Unreasonableness* of exacting Tythes will yet more plainly appear, if it be considered, that if Tythes were a suitable Mainenance for a Protestant Ministry, yet the Clergy now do nothing for the People (nor indeed have any thing to do) which can deserve so great a Compensation. For let it not be soon forgotten

ten, nay, let the Parishioners in every Parish take notice, that this Priest, speaking of the present Clergy, hath said, *Our only Work is to explain the written Word of God, and apply the same*, page 86. Yet a little after saith, (page 92, 93.) *Whatsoever is necessary to Salvation, either to be believed or done (as the History of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection and Ascension) the Duties of the first and second Table, the Love of God and our Neighbour, all the Evangelical Precepts, and the Essentials of Religion, are in some place or other in holy Scripture, fitted to the most vulgar Capacity, and shallowest Understanding, are made such plain and easie Doctrines, that he that runs may read them, being fitted to the Capacity of the most unlearned. so that here nothing needs explaining, all things necessary to Salvation are so plain already. Whatever then they explain and apply, is by his own Confession not necessary to Salvation, and this he saith is their only Work.* But is it not a great Injustice, and extream Unrighteousness in the Clergy, to exact and tear from the poor Husband-man the Tenth Part of his Crop for only explaining, and applying something that is no way necessary to the poor man's
Salva-

Salvation, nor in that respect can do him any good? O great Oppression! O foul Abuse!

But he saith, *To put the thing out of all doubt, our Laws have made Tythes a Freehold*, page 137.

Ans. A Freehold doth he call them! Such a Freehold, I wis, as holds the greatest part of the Nation in Bondage. But what Laws are they that have made Tythes a Freehold? Where are they to be found? He is peremptory in another Case, Shew the Text; shew the Statute; 'tis the Opponent's part to prove, page 152. I desire him therefore to shew those Laws, produce those Statutes, that have made Tythes a Freehold to the Clergy, whose Right he insists upon (for if he will say they are a Freehold to the Laity, that will be so far from advancing his Cause, that it will yet further prove the Lawfulness of alienating Tythes to common Uses, notwithstanding the Solemn Dedication of them to God, which he so much brays of) That the Charter of *Ethelwolf* (by which Tythes are claimed) was popish, superstitious, wicked, is sufficiently shewed before. What hath been done by succeeding times, in Confirmation of it and them, it more concerned my Opponent to search

search, then me: But probably he might designedly omit it, as well knowing that such an *Inquiry* would no way conduce to the *Credit* of his *Claim*. For if Tythes were *born* (as I may say) *in bad times*, to be sure they were *brought up in worse*. If they were *granted in the dusk of the Evening*, they were *confirmed in the Midnight of popery*. And that the Reader may see I speak not this without Ground, I'll here set down the Preamble of a Grant made by King *Stephen*, about the Year One Thousand One Hundred Thirty Nine.

‘Inasmuch as by the Providence of divine
 ‘Mercy, we know that it is appointed, and
 ‘being published far and near by the Preach-
 ‘ing of the Church, it soundeth in all Mens
 ‘Ears, that by the giving of *Alms* the Bonds
 ‘of Sins may be loosed, and the Rewards of
 ‘Heavenly Joys obtained: I *Stephen* by the
 ‘Grace of God King of the English, desiring
 ‘to have a Part with them, who by an hap-
 ‘py kind of trading, exchange Heavenly
 ‘things for Earthly, being pricked forward
 ‘by the Love of God, and for the Salvation
 ‘of my Soul, and the Souls of my Father and
 ‘Mother, and of all my Parents and Prede-
 ‘cessors, &c. By this Reader, thou mayst see
 upon

upon what Grounds they went, and by what Principles they were acted in those times; and that the Confirmation was sufficiently *su*fficient to the Institution.

Long after this, *Henry* the Eighth, being more *Papist* than *Protestant* (though he had transferred the Supremacy from the Pope to himself) and believing, as most of the other Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, so that of Tythes being due to God and Holy Church, in the Twenty Seventh Year of his Reign, made a Law for the Payment of Tythes, the Preamble whereof is thus, '*Forasmuch as divers Numbers of Evil disposed Persons, &c. having no Respect to their Duties to Almighty God, but against Right and good Conscience, have attempted to substract and withhold in some places the whole, and in some places great Parts of the Tythes and Oblations, as well personal as predial, due unto God and holy Church, &c.*' This is the first Parliamentary Law that I find amongst our Statutes for the Paiment of Tythes: and this, take notice, was made by a King and Parliament that were *Papists*, upon a *Popish Supposition* that Tythes were due to God and holy Church. The same King, in the Thirty Seventh Year of his Reign, upon the Dissolution of
Reli-

Religious Houses (as they were then called) made another Law for the Payment of Tythes, supposing them still *Duties to Almighty God*. And in Pursuance of these Laws of his, his Son and Successor *Edward the Sixth* made another, grounding it upon those which his Father had made before. So that neither of these Kings made *any new grant* of Tythes; but taking it for granted that *they were due to God and holy Church*, they made Provision for the Payment of them. Yet both the one and the other restrained Suits & Tryals for Tythes to the *Ecclesiastical Courts*, which shews they did not understand Tythes to be a *Temporal Right*.

These are all the Statute Laws I have hitherto met with concerning Tythes. And these being built upon a *false Supposition*, that Tythes were due to God and holy Church (a Doctrine purely *Papish*, hatcht at Rome, and here preacht up with *thundering Excommunications* by the Pope's Emissaries and Agents) why should they be continued to make that

* Error which was at first but
 * Error *minimus in principio, fit major in medio, maximus,* too great, still greater by persisting in it? However it is too great Weakness in the Clergy to call Tythes a *Freehold*, and claim to themselves a *Temporal*

ral Right in them by these Sta- *mus in fine,*
 tutes, when the Statutes them-
 selves suppose them due by *Divine Right* :
 For, for a man to claim that by a *Temporal*
Right, from a *Temporal Law*, which the
 Law he claims by commands to be paid as
 due by a *Divine Right*, is *meer Juggling*.
 Now we see these Statutes did not set up or
 appoint the Payment of Tythes upon any ci-
 vil Ground, but took it for granted that Tythes
 are due to God and holy Church. But if this
 were a *Mistake*, and that it doth really now
 appear that Tythes are not due to God and
 holy Church, the Foundation and Reason
 of the Law being taken away,
 the Law it self must needs cease *Cessante*
 to be in Force. * For the Law not *Ratione*
 making them due, but supposing *legis cis-*
 them due by a former Right, if *sat lex.*
 they were not so due, how then
 can the Law be of Force !

But what is it the Priests claim a Property
 in? Is it the Profits and Encrease of the Lands?
 that I have shewed doth comprehend and in-
 clude the *Labour, Sweat, Care, Industry,*
Charge, Skill and Diligence of the Husband-
 man, without which the other would not be:
 And for any man to pretend a Property in
 these

these, is *ridiculous*. Who would not smile at (and Pitty) that Priest that should tell his Parishioners he *hath a Property in their Understandings*, in their *Strength*, in their *Care*, in their *Industry*, &c! But if nothing less then a *Property* will serve the Turn, yet where is *this Property* rested? In *whom* doth it lie? Is it in the Person of the Priest? No such matter: For a man may be a Priest in *Orders*, & yet have *no Power* to demand *Tithes*. Nor, how long soever he hath been a Priest, hath he any thing to do with *Tithes*, until by *Presentation*, *Institution* and *Induction* he is *invested with Office*; and w^henever he parts with that *Office*, he parts with the *Tithes* also. So that the *Property* (if there were any) would lie in the *Office*, not in the *Priest*. And what is the *Office*? It was to be sure a *Ecclesiastical* Office when *Tithes* were first paid to it in this Nation, an *Office set up by the Pope*, and that not as a *Secular Prince*, but as a *Pope* (as a *Spiritual Father*: For such he pretends to be but if there had been a *Property* in the *Office*, yet seeing the *Office* is *set aside*, and the *Pope*, who was the *Author* of it *cast off*; surely whatsoever *property* was in the *Office*, must needs be *gone along with it*.

But

But to manifest yet further the *Emptiness* of this plea of the Priests Property in Tythes, let it be considered, that the Priest, after all his *Boasting Talk* of property and *Pre-empt*, hath no power to take *One Sheaf or Ear* of the *Husbandman's Corn* from off his Ground; until the Owner hath severed it as Tythe from the Remainder, and thereby first *disseized* himself of that Part, and by his own Act given the Priest a Title thereunto. So that the Priest's Title lies in the Gift of the Owner; nor hath he any Propriety there, until the Owner by setting it out for him, hath made him one. Only the Law supposing Tythe due to God and holy Church enjoyns the Owner to set it out, and that under a penalty, which if he refuse to do, he incurs the penalty, but the property remains intire in himself.

But saith the Priest, *I told you before, that Tythes and other Church-Revenues have been settled by those that were actually seized of them in Law, page 154.*

Ans^r. *I tell you, and I told you, are his two great Proofs; and he speaks it so confidently, as if he thought it sufficient Demonstration to say, I told you.* The best on't is, we are not bound to believe all he tells us.

He might have done well to have told us *who* those Doners were, that were so *actually* seized, and *what* it was they were seized of. What he means by other Church Revenues, neither doth he express, nor I intend to inquire. Tythe is the present Subject; to that let us stick. If Tythes be the Tenth of the profit, or increase of the Land, and they that settled Tythes (as he saith) were actually seized of them in Law, then surely they could settle *no more* than they were so seized of, and they could be actually seized of *no other profits*, or increase, then what did grow, increase, or renew upon the Land, *while they were actually seized of it*. So that *such Settlement*, how valid soever while they lived, *must needs expire with them*. Is any one so void of Reason, as to imagine that they who were possesse of Land an hundred Years ago, could then settle and dispose of the profits and increase that shall grow and arise upon that Land an hundred Years hence; which profit cannot arise *barely* from the Land, but from the *Labour, Industry and Stock* of the Occupier? Were ever any actually seized of the *Labour* of the Husbandman's *Hands*, of the *Sweat* of his *Brows*, of the *Judgement, Understanding* and *Skill* that God hath given him, of
the

the *Stock* he imployes, the *Cost* he bestows, the *Care*, *Pains*, *Industry* and *Diligence* he exercises for the obtaining of a Crop? That *all these are included in the Crop*, I have shew-
ed, and that *without these* the Crop comes not. He therefore that undertakes to dis-
pose of *any Part* of the Crop, takes upon
him so far to dispose of *these also*; but with
what Right, let the Reader judge. Indeed, if
they who were anciently seized of the Lands
had then set out and settled any Part of the
Land it self, it had been something to the
purpose. But let not any man imagine that
they had Power to charge their Posterity
with that *which was no way theirs*, nor which
in any true Sense or Construction they could
be said to have any Property in, and which is
not paid by Reason of that which is derived
from them. For indeed, if the Case be right-
ly stated, Tythe is not paid of Land, nor
simply by Reason of the Land, but of the
Profits and Encrease growing and arising, and
by Reason of the Labour and Stock imploy'd
to the production of that Encrease. This
will more plainly appear, if we observe that
by the Statute of *Edward* the sixth, Trades-
men and Handycrafts-men (who possess no
Land) are enjoined to pay the Tenth of the

Profits, Encrease or Gain, arising by their Trades or Labour, as well as the Husbandman the Encrease of the Land. Which shews, that as they are tythed for the Labour, Industry and Stock which they exercise in their Trades and Callings; so is he also for the Pains, Care, Skill and Stock which he imploies in his Calling of Husbandry. If therefore, he that *hath Land*, and he that *hath no Land*, are both alike bound to pay Tythe, how can it be said, that he that hath Land payeth Tythe for the Land? If a man hath never so much Land, and yet no Encrease, no Tythe can be demanded. If he hath *no Land* at all, and yet by any other way hath *Encrease*, he is liable by the Law to pay Tythe. If a man so husband his Land that the Encrease of it is not to be severed from it, as (for Instance) if he convert it to *Pasture*, and feed Cattel upon it, he shall not be accountable for the Tythes of the Grasse so eaten, but if any thing at all be demanded, it can be only a rate Tythe for the Cattel there feeding. But if he feed his Land with *Horses*, very little, if any thing at all is recoverable for Tythe. And if he *plant Wood*, and let it grow for Timber, he is not liable to any Tythe at all. From these Instances it is manifest, both that it is in the
Pow:

Power of the Occupant to make the Tythe much, little or nothing at all : And also that those Tythes that are paid, are paid not purely in Consideration of the Land it self, but with Relation to the Stock & Personal Estate employed upon the Land, together with the Labour and Industry of him that occupies it. But because it cannot be supposed that any man's Ancestors had a Property in, or were actually seized of that very Stock, and Personal Estate which he now possesseth, much less of the Strength, Health, Ability to labour, Wisdom, Judgement and Understanding which he hath received from God, out of, through and by Reason of which, Tythes are now paid ; it could not justly be in the Power of any man's Ancestors, so to settle Tythes, or oblige his Posterity to pay them, according as they are now demanded and received : for that were to charge an Incumbrance upon that, which himself had never any Property in.

His Supposition of some charitably disposed Persons, giving certain Lands and Tenements to every Parish for the Maintenance of the poor, is not at all the same Case with this of Tythes, although he saith (page 145.) it is the same, and that it will be evident to every understand-

ing man. But I believe no understanding-man can see the Cases to be the same. For in that of the Poor, there is a *certain Settlement* of Lands and Tenements, in which it is to be supposed the Donor had a *Legal Property*, or of which he was *actually seized*, at the time of the Gift. But in the Case of Tythes, here is no Gift of *Lands and Tenements*, but of the *Increase* growing and arising through, and by Reason of the *Labour, Care, Industry and Stock* of the Occupier, which he that gave the Tythes neither had, nor could have, any *Property* in, nor was or could be, *actually seized of*, and therefore had no Power to give. So that the Cases are no whit alike, and therefore the *Destroying of Tythes* hath no Tendency at all to *destroy Hospitals*. Nor are the *Tenants* to such Hospital-Lands, thereby *discharged from the Payment of their respective Rents*: No; but are under the *same Obligation* as before, both as they were *contracted by themselves*, and so are a free and voluntary Act of their own; and also as the *whole Rent* they pay is not the *full Profit* and *Increase* of the *whole Land* they held; but such a *Proportion only*, as the Land it self is valued or rated at. So that the *Increase* of their own *Labour and Industry*, and the
Im-

Improvement of their own *Stock*, is not *exacted* from them, but left to them to *disfray Charges*, and for their own *Subsistence* and *Maintenance*. But in the Case of Tythes it is far otherwise: For the Tythe is the *full and intire Profits*, and *Encrease* of the whole tenth Part of the Land, without any *Allowance* for Charges, or regard to the *Subsistence* of the Occupier: Of which more anon.

He sayes, *All Tenants* may as reasonably say, that the *Payment of Rent* to their *Respective Landlords*, is a *National Burden* and *Oppression*, as that Tythes are a great *Oppression*, &c. page 155.

Ans. No such matter. For, *First*, The Tenant for his Rent hath of his Landlord the *Worth* of his Rent. But for his Tythes he receives of the Priest it may be *nothing at all*, however that which to him is *worth nothing*, being by the Priest's own Confession (page 92, 93.) *not necessary to his Salvation*, upon which account it is that he payes his Tythes. *Secondly*, Rent is a *Voluntary Contract*, and the Maxim is, *Volenti not fit Injuria*, i. e. He that willingly undertakes a thing is not injured. But Tythe is *not Voluntary now*, but taken by *Force and Violence*. And I doubt not but, if every English Man durst

Freely speak his own Sense, nine Parts of ten of the whole Nation would unanimously cry, *TYTHES ARE A GREAT OPPRESSION.*

But the main Question he sayes is, *Whether they that purchased Lands and Tenements did also purchase the Tythe?*

Ans^r. They purchased *all that was not excepted out of the Purchase*, but Tythes were *not excepted out of the Purchase*. If they who have purchased have no Right to the Tenth Part, I see not how they can claim a Right to the Nineth, or indeed to any of the nine parts; for *they purchased them all alike*. And therefore in Deed of Bargain and Sale, it is said, that the Seller doth *grant, Bargain, Sell, &c. ALL that, &c. with its Appurtenances, and EVERY PART and parcel thereof (the tenth as well as the Nine) and also All the Estate, Right, Title, Interest, Property, Claim and Demand whatsoever, &c.* And if there be any Rents or Services reserved, *they are expressly excepted*. But no Exception of Tythes did I ever yet see (or hear of) in any Deed of Purchase. But sayes he, *Will you sell more then you bought?* No, say I; for I *bought all*: And therefore if I sell all, I sell *no more then I bought*. Besides, he that

that buyes Land, pays so much Money for the Land only, as Matter for him to work upon: but when he has this Land, if he will have Profit and Increase from it, he must *purchase* that after another manner; he payes for that (and many times dear enough too) by the *Labour* and *Charge* he bestows in tilling, dressing and manuring it. And if in this Sense he may be said to *purchase* the *Nine Parts* of the Crop or Increase, in the same sense he *purchaseth* the *Tenth Part* also: for he bestows his Charge and Pains on all alike; and the *Tenth Part* stands him in as much as any one of the *Nine*.

But he sayes, *Though the Tenant payes Tythes, yet they are no Inconvenience to him, because he payes less Rent in Consideration thereof.*

Ans^r. There is a Fallacy in this: for if it should be granted, that the Tenant doth pay less Rent in Consideration of Tythes (which yet is questionable) yet the *Abatement*, which he is supposed to have in Rent is not *proportionable* or answerable to the Value of the Tythes he payes. I demonstrate it thus: Suppose a Landlord lets a Farm for Ninety Pound a Year, which if it were Tythe-free would

would yield an Hundred. The Tenant to pay his Rent, defray all his Charge of Husbandry, and have a Comfortable Subsistence and Maintenance for him'self and his Family, must (according to the Computation of skilful Husbandmen) by his *Care, Industry* and *Labour*, together with the *Employment* of his *Stock*, raise upon his Farm *three Rents*, or three times as much as his Rent comes to, which will make Two Hundred and Seventy Pound, and the tenth part of Two Hundred & Seventy Pounds is Twenty Seven Pounds, so that if the Tenant should have *Ten Pounds* a Year abated in his Rent because of Tythes, and he payes *Seven and Twenty Pounds* a Year for Tythes, then does he pay *Seventeen Pounds* a Year in *Ninety*, more then he is supposed to be allowed in his Rent.

Besides, observe the Difference between the Landlord's Dealing and the Priest's: The Landlord doth not take or desire the *whole Increase* and Profit that is made upon his Farm: he knows it would be *unreasonable*, because the *whole Year's Labour and Stock* of the Tenant is employed in it And therefore, seeing he finds only Land, and the Tenant finds all manner of Workmanship, Stock and Charges,

Charges, he is contented, by a pretty equal kind of Partition, to divide the Profits between them, so that he takes no more for the Rent of his Land, then it is supposed the Tenant may make double so much to himself, for the Improvement of his Stock, for his Charge and Labour. But when the merciless Priest comes, he does not say, *Neighbour, though I claim the Tenth Part, yet seeing you have been at the Pains and Charge to get it for me, I'll do it no worse with you then your Landlord does; as he takes One Part and leaves you Two, so divide the Tythe into Three Parts, I'll be contented with One of them, and do you keep the other Two, for the Pains and Charges you have been at in procuring it.* No, no: *Who ever heard a Priest say so?* But like the *Sabeans* and *Caldees* he falls on, and sweeps all away together. He takes the full Tenth Part of the Increase of the whole Farm, and leaves the poor Farmer no Consideration at all for all the Charges and Toyl he has bestowed about it. And yet he will wipe his Mouth, and say, *This is no Oppression, no Grievance at all: whenas indeed there is none greater in the Nation.* But if the Landlord should have as little Justice as the Priest, and should take away all the Increase of the

Nine

Nine Parts, as the Priest does all the Increase of the Tenth, what would become of the poor Farmer! He would have nothing left him. Nay, who should sow the Land again? for the unreasonable Priest does not leave him of the Tythe, where-will to sow the tenth part of the Land against another Year, but keeping him in an Egyptian Bondage, expects he should make Bricks for him, although he allows him no Straw.

And yet this must not be thought hard or grumbled at, to such a pass is this unhappy Nation brought. Nay, he reckons the People have an *easy time* on't now, o're they had in the Time of the Law. For when he goes about to clear the Clergy from the Charge of *Judaism* in taking Tythes, he says, *Should we challenge and receive our Tythes as they were due to the Levites, our Coffers would be much fuller then they are, and the Impositions much heavier upon the People,* pag. 134.

Ans. No: the Charge is much heavier now upon the People, then it was under the *Levitical Priesthood*. For, 1. The Tribe of *Levi* had no Inheritance with their Brethren, no Share in the Division of the Land; but had Tythes assigned them instead of their
Pro-

Proportion of Land, *Numb.* 18. 20. So that the other eleven Tribes had all the Land between them. They had so much the more Land, their Lots were the bigger; and this was some Consideration for their Tythes. But now adayes the Priests have not only the Tythes, but their Shares also of Land, so far as they are able to compass; in which Respect it is harder now with the People then it was then.

2 If the *Levitical* Priests had offerings, so have these. What mean all the *Easter-Reckonings*, *Midsummer-Dues* (as they are called) *Smock-Money*; *Garden Penny* &c. Money for Marrying, Money for Christening, Money for Churching of Women, Money for giving the Communion, Money for Burjing, Money for Breaking the Ground, Money for Funeral Sermons, Money for Lectures, and what not? All for Money, and without Money or Money's worth nothing will be done. So that their Revenues far exceed those of the *Levitical* Priesthood, and the Charge falls heavier on the People.

3. Those Tythes and Offerings under the Law maintained all the Officers belonging to that Tabernacle, so that the People were at

no further Charge. But now the Priests alone run away with all this ; and their under Officers, as Clerks, Sextons, &c. are fain to be maintained by the People beside ; the ringing of the Bell, the reading of the Psalm, saying Amen, and whipping out the Dogs are charged upon the Peoples Account, and they are made to pay it, which still lays greater and heavier Loads upon the People.

4. Out of the Tythes under the Law Provision was made for the Fatherless, the Widow and the Stranger, Deut. 14. 28, 29. But now the Clergy take all the Tythes to their own use, leaving the Fatherless, the Widow, &c. to shift for themselves as they can. So that the Fatherless and Widow, &c. might, notwithstanding the Tythes, perish for want, did not the People relieve and maintain them at no small Expence besides. Thus it appears, that the Charge is much greater upon the People now, then it was then ; the Little Finger of the English Clergy being heavier then the Loys of the Levitical Priesthood. But to proceed.

He confesses (page 157.) That the Apostles had not Tythes in their days, and he gives this as one Reason for it, because they could
not

not have them, if they would, the Levites being in Possession of them.

Ans. But if Tythes ought to have been paid, what hindred their receiving them of the Gentiles that were converted? some of whom were so zealously affected, that they could have pulled out their Eyes, and have given them to the Apostle, Gal. 4. 15. And can it be thought, that if he had demanded Tythes of them, or they had understood them to be due unto him, they would not readily have paid them?

Again, he says, *We ought to consider that Tythes were an Improper Maintenance for the Apostles, because of their Unfixt State of Life.*

Ans. Oh! were Tythes indeed an Improper Maintenance for the Apostles! If he and his Brethren, who pretend to be the Apostles Successors, did so walk as they have them for an Example, they would find Tythes an improper Maintenance for them also. But seeing the Apostles State of Life was unfixt, who, I pray, fixed your State of Life? who divided Provinces into Parishes, & set up Parish Priests? was it not a Pope? Had you not your fixt State of Life and your Maintenance by Tythes from one and the same power?

But

But I remember this Priest sayes (pag. 86.) *The Apostles, and we (the Clergy) act under Different Circumstances.* And I do not wonder at it; for so did the *true* Ministers and the *false* in all Ages. But I wish the Apostles and these differed in *Circumstances only*.

He has another Reason yet, why the Apostles had not Tythes, namely, *They had no need of them; for as they had their Gifts, so their Maintenance by a Miraculous Providence.*

Ans. This is *notoriously* false. They had their Maintenance in an *Ordinary* Way, without any *Miracle* at all. *Whatsoever* was set before them, by such as did receive them, *that they were to eat and drink*, Luk. 10 7, 8. Where then was the Miracle? was it in the Believers setting Food before them? or in their eating it, when it was so set before them?

But sayes he, pag. 158. *If you conclude that we must be in all things as were the Apostles, then must you of the Laity do now as the Laity did then, who sold their Possessions, and laid them down at the Apostles Feet, Acts 4.*

Ans. That does not follow. The Apostles (and in them all Ministers of Christ) were

were commanded to preach freely (*Freely ye have received, freely give*, Mat 10. 8.) and for their Maintenance to receive such things only, as by Believers were freely administered to them, *Luke* 10. 7, 8. But the Believers were not commanded to sell their Possessions; that was a voluntary Act in them, as is manifest from the Instance of *Ananias*, *While it remained* (saith Peter, *Acts* 5. 4.) *was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own Power?* So that he might have chosen whether he would have sold his Land or not; and after it was sold, he might yet have chosen, whether he would have brought the Money, or any part of it, into that Common Treasury or no. But the Apostles were not at their own choice, whether they would preach the Gospel or no. But sayes Paul, *A Dispensation of the Gospel is committed unto me, a Necessity* (of preaching it) *is laid upon me, yea, Wo is unto me if I preach not the Gospel*, 1 Cor. 9. 16, 17. And the same Apostle, when he took his Leave of the Elders of the *Ephesian Church*, did not exhort them to covet other mens Possessions; but told them, *I have coveted no man's Silver, or Gold, or Apparel: Yea, you your selves know* (said he) *that these Hands have ministered unto my Necessities, and to them that*

were with me. And I have shewed you all things (adds he) how that so labouring, ye ought to support the weak; and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give, then to receive, Acts 20. 33, 34, 35.

But he tells us *We ought to pay them Tythes for Conscience sake, because the King commands it, p. 158.*

Ans. Every Command of a King is not for Conscience sake to be actually obeyed. Histories, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, inform us, That many things have been commanded by Kings, which for Conscience sake ought not to have been performed. Instances of this kind abound in the Histories of the Kings of Israel and Judah. And if the King should command this man but to throw up his settled Maintenance, and preach freely; I question how forward he would be in obeying such a Command. But if an active Obedience must for Conscience sake be yielded to every Command of a King, it must be either simply as he is a King, or as he is a Christian King; if simply as a King, then if I lived in Turkey, and the Grand Signior command me to maintain his Priests, I must do it. If as a Christian-King, then if I lived in France, and the French King command me to maintain

tain his *Priests*, it seems by this Man's Doctrine, I must do it, and that for Conscience sake too, how contrary soever it be to Good Conscience.

But he sayes, *The First Fruits and Tenths is one of the fairest Flowers belonging to the Crown.*

Answ. He greatly mistakes, being herein somewhat like the Crow, which is said to think her own Bird White * though others see it to be Black.

No Flower can be fair in an English Crown, which was taken out of a Pope's Mitre. If nothing *Asinus* *afino, sui* *sui pul-* *cher.*

else could be said against it, but that it once stuck in the Tripple Crown, that alone were enough to make it unworthy to be worn in an English Diadem.

He seems greatly offended that he and his Brethren are counted *Hirelings*; and to vindicate himself he makes a Comparison between them and the Judges of the Land: You know (sayes he) the King has Twelve Judges, &c. and these have an Honourable Allowance from the Exchequer. Will you therefore say that they are *Hirelings*, and sell Justice? and is not ours the same Case? pag 159.

Answ. No: for you pretend to be *Ministers of Christ*; whereas they pretend no higher then to be *Ministers of State*. You call your selves *Spiritual Persons*: but you reckon them but *Lay Men*. You challenge to your selves a *Spiritual Function*: they claim but a *Civil or Temporal Office*. They therefore standing in a *civil Capacity*, may reasonably and fairly, without any *Imputation* of Injustice, receive what their Master is pleased to bestow upon them. But you, who pretend to be *Ministers of Christ Jesus*, are therefore justly condemnable as Hirelings, because ye will not be content with that *Maintenance*, which he (whom ye call, though untruly, your Master) hath appointed, but seek for Hire from others.

Again, He takes it ill, that any should think they would abandon their Profession, if they should be bereaft of their Preferments. I hope (sayes he) many of us can appeal to the Searcher of Hearts, that we embraced the Ministry upon better Grounds, then Temporal Interests, &c. I pray you therefore ask your own Conscience, whether it were likely to be Reason, or rather Envy, that drew up this Charge against us, p. 160.

Answ. I would not think hardly of them
all,

all, nor more hardly of any then they deserve. But yet I must tell him, he need not take it ill, if such a thing be questioned. considering *what Ground* has been given for it. I do not know his standing (because he had not Ingenuity enough to give his Name) and therefore can say nothing to him particularly. But if he be not a very Young Man, he cannot be ignorant, that once within these Twenty Years, when their Preferments were taken away, *those of his Profession were very scarce to be found*, inso much as at that day the old Proverb began to come in use, *No Penny, No Pater Noster*. Certain it is, *the Shepherds were fled*, and had left their *Flocks* to the Mercy of those, whom they accounted no better then *Wolves*; and many good men thought the Reason to be, *because they were but Hirelings*, John 10: 13. But to pass that by,

There remains yet a material Point to be considered, viz. *For what Reason the Quakers should pay Tythes, when by their Separation they have no Benefit of his Ministry?* His Reason is, *That the Minister is not to Blame for their Separation, or lack of that Benefit, but desires they would enjoy it while he is attending his Office*, p. 161.

Ans. If the Minister be one that for corrupt Interest hath intruded himself (as it seems by what he says pag. 11. some such there be) if the Minister be a Man of a Vicious and Intemperate Life, of a Disorderly Conversation, such as the Apostle has exhorted to withdraw from, is not the Minister then to Blame for the Separation? Admit he be a man of tolerable Sobriety, yet if his Ministry can do me no good, am I not better without it? That which I aim is the Salvation of my Soul. He tells me (pag. 92, 93.) That whatsoever is necessary to my Salvation, is already so plain in the Scriptures, that I may understand it without his Help. To what End then should I make use of him?

But to come closer to the Point. He pretends to be a Minister of Christ. Where did Christ ever impower his Ministers to make people hear them, whether they will or no? or to exact Wages of them although they did not hear them? His Instruction to his Disciples was, Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, shake off the Dust of your Feet, Mat. 10. 14. And Paul says to the Jews, It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy

unworthy of Everlasting Life. lo, we turn to the Gentiles ; for so hath the Lord commanded us, &c. Acts 13. 46. He greatly mistakes, if he thinks it to be the Mind of Christ to impose his Gospel upon any, or, as the Spaniards are said to have dealt with the Indians, to make men Christians whether they will or no : Nay, nay ; he lovingly invites all ; he inwardly strives by his Spirit with all ; he graciously sends Adversaries to all ; but he obtrudes it upon none. And if he gave no Authority to his Apostles to compel any to hear them ; to be sure he gave them no Power to Demand, muchless Inforce a Maintenance from such, as did neither receive nor own them. It was especially provided in their Commission, that they should be first received, before they received any thing themselves, Luke 10. 8. And Paul says, He did not eat any man's Bread for nought, 2 Thes. 3. 8. And if these men were indeed Ministers of Christ, they would not be so eager and forward to receive of those they call Hereticks.

But as for that he says, that he desires we should enjoy the Benefit of his Ministry, what is it more then a Popish Priest may say to him? Would he hold himself bound in Reason or Equity to maintain that Popish Priest, or think

the other did justly in *Forcing a Maintenance* from him, because he had Liberty to hear him if he would? It may be he will say No; because a *Popish Priest* is not a Minister of Christ. *A very good Reason against them both.* But the *Popish Priest* no doubt will say He is, and the other *does no more.* But this man may say, *He has Law on his side:* so had the other *too lately* in this Nation, and has it *still* elsewhere. The Intent of my reasoning thus is to shew, that by the same Argument by which he would condemn us, he justifies not only the Practice of the *Papists* against the *Protestants* here of old, but also the Dealings of other *Sectaries* against his Brethren and himself of late.

Besides, it is *most weakly* argued, that we must be forced to maintain him, because we may hear him if we will. In this he is *more unjust* than the worst sort of men usually are: for take the most greedy and over-reaching Tradesman that one can find, though he should tell me his Ware is very Good, and that he has such as will fit my turn, yet he will not thrust it upon me, whether I like it or no; but leaves me to my own Liberty, either to take it or to leave it: and if I do not take it, to be sure he will never demand any thing

thing of me for it. But this Priest will either make us take his Ware, though we neither like it, nor have any need of it; or to be sure will make us pay for it, though we never take it. What can be *more unreasonable*, what *more dishonest* then this.

He next undertakes to defend the Priests in suing for Tythes; *if it be* (sayes he) *their Due they sue for, the Recovering of them by Course of Law will have no Injustice in it.*

Ans. In Civil Cases it is no Injustice for a man to recover his Due by Law. But neither is this a civil Case, nor Tythe his Due. His supposing it so, is but begging of the Question. If he will say, it appears to be his Due, because upon Tryal he recovers it at Law; I shall answer, that that Argument will no more prove Tythes due to him, then it will, that they were due to the *Papists* and *Presbyterians*, both which (the former of old, the latter of late) recovered them by Law. Will he therefore acquit them of Injustice? Will he say, Tythes were their Due? then *he and his Brethren had no Wrong*, from whom they were (by the latter) taken.

But for a Minister of Christ to sue men at Law for his Belly, is without all Precept, Precedent or Ground in Scripture, Religion or Reason.

Reason. It is contrary to the *Nature* of a Gospel-Maintenance, which is *altogether free* and voluntary, not at all *compulsory*. The Ministers of Christ were to *take what was given*, what was set before them: not to *demand, command, compel*. This Practice is more like that of the Sons of *Eli* (who were *Sons of Belial*, and knew not the Lord) who said, *We will have this, or We will have that, and if thou wilt not give it, we will take it by Force*, 1 Sam. 2. Or like the *Falie Prophets* mentioned by *Micha*, who prepared *War against them that put not into their Mouths*, Chap. 3. But when or where did any Minister of Christ ever do thus? Let him search the Holy Scriptures, let him turn over Ecclesiastical Histories, and produce such an Instance if he can.

Yet so little *Modesty* has he as to say, *The High-way Thief may as well implead the Justice of an Hue and-Cry, as the Quakers such a lawful Prosecution*. But this is a Position so utterly devoid of *Truth, Reason and Charity*, that without further Answer I dare commit it to the *Censure* of every disinterested Reader.

The

The Conclusion.

I Have now, Reader, gone through the several Heads of his Discourse, and given a particular Answer to the *most material* Passages therein. There remains in his last Leaf an old *over-worn* *Objection*, That the *primitive* Christians were different from us; in debating which, he shall hereafter (he says) be ready to bestow his Pains) as Providence shall give Occasion and Assistance. Seeing he puts it off to hereafter, I will not anticipate his Work, by saying any thing to it now: But whensoever he shall think fit to undertake that Task, I no way doubt but the Lord will enable me, or some other of his Servants to vindicate his Truth and Heritage from the Slanders and Falshoods of this man's Malevolent Tongue; and also, to discover and demonstrate how greatly He and his Brethren differ from the Apostles and primitive Christians in the greatest part of their Religion, having indeed neither the Power of Godliness, nor so much as the true Form thereof.

of. But of this no more at present, until further Occasion be offered. In the meantime, to give thee, Reader, a *little Taste* of the Temper of his Spirit, I here present thee with a short Collection of some of the Phrases and virulent Expressions, which his *Academical Education* hath bestowed upon us, viz.

The Spirit of Quakerism, and the Delusions of it. p. 3. *You may find the Picture of your Speakers drawn by Virgil (an Heathen Poet) where he brings in the Sybil possessed with her Daemon,* pag. 9. *Whetting their Tongues to speak the most prodigious Lyes, that is in the power of Malice to invent,* pag. 13. *The Lash of their Serpentine Tongues,* p. 14. *Blind Guides,* p. 89. *The Whim in his Pace,* p. 96. *The Devil and these,* p. 96. *Poor deluded Souls receive Falshood and Railing, Non-sense and Blasphemy, &c.* p. 106. *A Dream, a meer Fancy, a miserable Mistake, a False and Fantastical Light; they adore a Lye for Divine Revelation,* p. 107. *Sottish Wayes of Reasoning,* p. 108. *The Quakers a Company of fine Cheats,* p. 108. *A Fanatical Jesuit,* p. 109. *Out of the Mouth of a Quaker or a Jesuit,* p. 110. *A Company of*

of *Wandering Fellows* that have got into a *Road of Babling*, p. 114. *The Venom of their Tongues*, p. 116. *Sottish Ignorance*, p. 152. They are a *Company of Cheats and Impostors*, pag. 155.

These I confess I have not answered, not judging any *Weights of Argument* to lie in them, or that they tend to *prove* any thing, unless it be that he, from whom this corrupt *Fruit* springs, is likely himself to be one of those who for a corrupt *Interest* intrude themselves into *Sacred Offices* (as he says pag. 11.) or that that *Savage, Waspyish, Crusty Humour* of his *Natural Disposition* (which he speaks of pag. 119.) is not yet transformed into the *Meekness and Innocency* of a *Lamb*. But letting these things pass, I shall conclude with that *Saying* in *Cornelius Tacitus*, *Didicist ille maledicere, et ego contemnere*: i. e. He hath learned to speak Evil, and I to disregard it.

T. E.

THE END.